THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIV APRIL, 1937 No. 202

EDITORIAL

In one of Mrs. Oliphant's now forgotten stories—it was either *Salem Chapel* or *The Perpetual Curate*—a young priest exasperated certain members of his congregation almost beyond endurance on Easter Day by saying in his sermon that we ought to be grateful *to the Church* for giving us an Easter Festival! It does seem the last word in the noxious kind of institutionalism. Almost anyone, you would think, might agree that on Easter Day the Lord Himself had some claim to be remembered as the Creator of the Feast. To say anything else on Easter Day is a pitiful confusion of values. "If thou gloriest, it is not thou that bearest the root, but the root thee. Where then is the glorying? It is excluded" (Rom. xi. 18; iii. 27). We are rightly accustomed on Good Friday to say that the Faithful Remnant of the people of God is narrowed down to one Warrior, who contends alone against the massed forces of iniquity. Regardless of its historical context, but with a deep mystical appropriateness, we quote on the Monday in Holy Week, "I have trodden the winepress alone." If that is so, even more is the Victory a solitary achievement. There is a Sepulchre. Outside are a few stunned, broken-hearted men and women, a population which, in the interest of the Passover, is just recovering from the shock of witnessing a triple execution, a complacent priesthood, and a governor uneasily wishing that he could forget. Within life stirs. "It is not possible that he should be beholden of death." But it is such a faint stirring. And even when it comes to its full victory, and the stone rolls aside, there is in it nothing grandiose, nothing spectacular, only the beginning of an Event, a Fact in the history of mankind. History is full of events. They happen moment by moment. The evolution of the world consists in incalculable multitudes of them. And this was one. A tiny fact. It is the witness to a truth that makes all the difference to everybody, the truth

that love does not die, but it is all wrapped up within the compass of one Life. "How far that little candle throws its beams"!

Yes, Easter was a solitary victory and the glory of it belongs to the Lord alone. When it was rumoured in heaven that the Lion of the tribe of Judah had overcome, to open the book and the seven seals thereof, what the seer actually beheld was a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain. A Lamb. Just that. No more. Never has the fortune of the world been committed to a more slender-seeming thread, and never was there a victory that owed less to adventitious aid. No armaments, no might of the law, no advertisement, no expectation, no publicity, not even any friends. Only the love of God, and one perfectly obedient Will.

Yet for all that, there is something to be learned from the folly of the young preacher. There is that about the complete Easter season which illustrates his point of view. The Church does take hold of Easter, as received from the hand of the Lord, and make it a Festival. The Church exhibits the broken seals of the empty tomb, and "the napkin that was about the head, not lying with the linen cloths, but wrapped together in a place by itself." The Church has a grateful welcome for the wild flowers that are already growing in the garden, and also plants other growths, the beauty of which has been enriched by human care and skill. The Resurrection itself is—"Behold, Jesus met them saying, All hail." The part of the Church is—"They came and took hold of his feet, and worshipped him." And this worshipping has institutionalized itself into an annual, and indeed a weekly Festival. Why not? Spirit always creates for itself a body, ἴδιον σῶμα, a body of its own.

Let us boldly compare the faith of believers in the Risen Christ to the holy estate of Matrimony. There is in that at first a spring-like quality which gradually wanes, even as spring passes into summer. But it is replaced by something stronger and steadier, yet not less tender, and much more enduring. In the life of physical earth, summer glides into autumn, and then winter, the time of seeming death. In Holy Matrimony summer stands for strength, autumn for ripe maturity, and winter for the time when *Dominus tecum* must soon be said in the speech of earth for the last time. But the Easter faith is

such that those who are possessed by it " go from strength to strength " until " unto the God of gods appeareth every one of them in Sion." And it is the Easter season which catches the divine grace, and, without staling it, is competent to stabilize it and make it everlastingly available. If St. Paul can say of the Law of Moses that it is " spiritual," and " holy, and righteous, and good," much more the faith of a Church which has embodied itself in the institution of the Easter Festival is " a well of water springing up unto eternal life." The woman of Samaria in her ignorance was an institutionalist of the wrong sort. " Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come all the way hither to draw." The answer is that " God is Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth." Yes, and in the atmosphere of spirit and truth the living water is always to be had. And that means the life of the Church. Christ and the Church, Christ and the Church, the answer to all doubts and questionings. Remember the Revised Version rendering of Ephesians iii. 21. The A.V. rendering, " Glory in the church by Christ Jesus," seems almost to be infected with the heresy of the young priest. The R.V. knows both what is the essential atmosphere and what is the real climax—" Glory in the church and in Christ Jesus for ever and ever, Amen."

The figure of marriage is used by St. Paul (*e.g.*, in Rom. vii. 1-6) as an illustration of the relation with our Lord. Scott Holland, in his essay in *Lux Mundi*, compared faith with marriage. Let us bring the comparison back again the other way. Minds in the Church are exercised about proposals made by the Joint Committee of Convocation, and recently debated in the four Houses, that in certain circumstances a divorced and re-married person may be admitted to Holy Communion. It is assumed that " re-married " here relates to a civil marriage. The teaching and practice of the Western part of the Church is clear on that point, and indeed it is not easy to see how a priest could dictate and hear repeated the words " till death," if he knew that the person concerned had another partner still living. We assume the case of a divorced person who has subsequently made, as is legal and quite respectable, a civil marriage. It is contrary to Church order and therefore has no blessing from the Church, but it has been made before an officer of the State. Such a person may originally have been guilty or not guilty of the sin which broke the marriage. Or it is possible that such person may be involved in that cloud of uncertainty which, in the present state of the civil law, sometimes surrounds the whole process. The technically guilty

man may be only a kind-hearted man who has been willing to sacrifice his own credit for the sake of an erring wife. Guilty or not guilty does not make much difference for this purpose. The point is that the person has been married to one still living. Supposing that such person desires either to resume or, more probably, to begin, after conversion and confirmation, the habit of Communion, what then ?

It is gravely unfair to say of all those who take the line that it is impossible to admit such persons to Communion that they are void of pastoral instincts. Do you care nothing, it is said, for the souls which you thus condemn to outer darkness ? It is a shame to speak thus, because it is pastoral zeal, possibly an excess of it, which makes some of them at least take what is called the rigorist position ? Listen to one of them, a man universally respected as a shepherd of souls: " In view of the trust we hold, both for the individual who has got himself into an impossible position, and for the whole body of Christ, is not that really the message which we are bound to give, coupled with the assurance that God's grace will be sufficient for them, if this ' homage to righteousness is offered as suffering for the health of the whole fellowship '? If, on the other hand, the proposed course is adopted, will it help either Churchpeople or outsiders to realize better that the Church takes the sin of adultery seriously, and the Christian belief in marriage, and will it really be for the truest health of the soul of the individual ? I cannot but help thinking that it is just this side of the whole question which has not, as yet, been considered and faced as it should have been. Our Lord's words, ' Be ye perfect,' continually come back to me. Surely we are bound to put before all men the highest and the best, together with the confident assurance that no ' hard cases ' can be too hard for the Holy Spirit to deal with, if the individual soul will not be content with any second best, but go for the highest and the best."

In effect this is: " I do not excommunicate you, but I summon you to excommunicate yourself, and to be brave enough to trust that our Lord, the Great Shepherd of all the sheep, will accept your penance as your true and necessary sacrifice, and will give you, apart from that actual Sacrament for which you have become disqualified, the grace which you desire." Can anything be said which, without damaging the force of these high and noble words, will turn them another way ? It seems that two things can be said. While every priest must know

that it is sometimes right to break in order to build, the breaking process is for a time only. The penance may be protracted and severe, but, be the day weary and be the day long, it ringeth at length to that Evensong which has the promise of Communion on the morrow. And this is a life-penance. But, it will be said, the person has entered upon a life-state of second marriage. Whatever is required by such a state must be life-long. But surely here comes in our second point. The soul in question is either a late-learner, and thus handicapped, or one of a less sure and stable quality. There is, it seems, a desire for Communion. A faithful priest is eager to recognize such desire. Just because it has arisen, so to speak, in the wilderness, it probably seems to him more eager than the desire of many of the ninety and nine. Their approach, as he knows, is in many ways less happy and less beautiful than it might be. He may exhort, in public and private, but how can he know that the infirmities will ever be shaken off? In other words, he is facing the possibility of life-long unworthiness. Yet he does not forbid. Is he to require from the eleventh-hour labourers or from the constitutionally weak labourers a greater sacrifice than he would from those whose record is without public censure, but are suspected of "ca' canny" practices? Or is the penitent to be referred to the bishop in the hope that the chief pastor, maintaining the standard and requiring such penance as may be possible, will bind up a broken soul into a renewed fellowship? Such fellowship will be felt to be imperfect, but the soul will be spared the separation which only a very strong soul could bear. There is force in the appeal to the power of the Holy Spirit quoted above, but it was followed by an "if." Can you ask for the highest from the second-best?

An apology. In the March number the name of Miss Comper, editor of *Spiritual Songs*, was mis-spelt on page 180 and on the cover as Cowper. They are both famous names, but we regret the error.

THE EVIDENCE FOR OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION*

THE evidence for our Lord's Resurrection is in two main divisions. First, concerning the grave in which He had been buried. Secondly, concerning His appearances as risen.

I

The evidence about the grave comes first. Those who deny the supernatural Resurrection of our Lord's Body are divided in their explanation.

1. Some assert that the grave was *not empty*. The Body was there all the time. But the disciples did not look, because they fled away at once to Galilee; or, if they remained in Jerusalem, their agitation and confusion led them to look into the wrong grave; or else they were not interested about the grave at all, because they thought they had actually seen Him after He was dead. Thus attention was not directed to the grave until at a later time, when naturally identification had become impossible. Not many negative critics are satisfied with this opinion. That is natural, for this opinion disregards the evidence. The evidence places the discovery of the empty grave first in order of time, and the appearances afterwards. So far from displaying no interest in the grave, the disciples display the greatest concern about it. The chief disciples visit it themselves, and therefore are still remaining in Jerusalem. It is therefore not surprising that critics who deny that the grave was empty are few.

2. The majority of those who do not believe that our Lord's Body ever rose from the dead admit that the grave in Joseph's garden was actually found to be *empty*. But they are unable to agree in their attempts to explain why the Body was not there.

One explanation attempted is that Jesus did not die upon the Cross, but only swooned, and recovered consciousness in the coolness of the grave. It is best to leave the sceptic Strauss to answer this.

"It is impossible that a being who had stolen half dead out of the sepulchre, who crept about weak and ill, wanting medical treatment, who required bandaging, strengthening and indulgence, and who still, at last, yielded to his sufferings, could have given to the disciples the impression that he was a Con-

* A lecture before the St. Paul's Cathedral Lecture Society.

queror over death and the grave, the Prince of Life, an impression which lay at the foundation of their future ministry."*

But if Jesus Himself was not supernaturally raised, and did not recover from insensibility in the grave, the only alternative explanation is that some person or persons took the Body away. In recent years this explanation has been much discussed. The legal maxim has been applied. Find the person on whom the disappearance of the Body would confer the most advantage, and the actual perpetrator is detected. Who moved the stone? Who would profit most by its removal? Either it was done by friends, or else by enemies. Already, in St. Matthew's Gospel, the Jews declared that the removal of the Body was done by friends.

If the Body was not removed by His friends, then it must have been removed by His enemies. In which case those enemies of Christ held in their power the unanswerable refutation of the Resurrection. All they had to say was, "We took the Body away, and we know where we buried it." If the authorities, whether Jewish or Roman, had been able to say that, belief in the reality of bodily Resurrection of Christ must have been completely and hopelessly undermined. But that is exactly what the Jews have never said. The mediæval Jewish denial of Christ's Resurrection attributed the emptiness of the grave, as the Jews did in St. Matthew's time, to the fraudulent action of His friends. They never ventured to declare, "We ourselves took the Body away."

Evidence that the grave was empty is given by all the Evangelists. The earliest Gospel reports that the women saw that the stone which covered the entrance had been rolled away. They are told, "He is risen, He is not here." St. Mark is repeated by St. Luke and St. Matthew. In St. Luke, St. Peter saw the linen clothes laid by themselves, and went away wondering. The disciples at Emmaus are perplexed because the Body could not be found. In the fourth Evangelist the folded grave clothes produced in one Apostle the conviction that the Body had risen.

St. Paul does not say that the grave was empty. But he says that Christ died, was buried, and rose. The obvious meaning is that the Body which died was the Body that was buried, and the Body which was buried was the Body which rose. The implication is that the grave was empty.

St. Paul declares that the fact of the Resurrection is what he had himself received; received no doubt from the original Apostles in the Church at Jerusalem. And here it is significant that, in the first sermon ever preached by the Christian Church,

* Strauss, *Life of Jesus for the German People.*

St. Peter laid the greatest emphasis on the emptiness of the grave where the Lord was buried. The Apostle drew the sharpest contrast between the case of David, "who is both dead and buried and his sepulchre is with us unto this day,"* and the case of Christ, whose flesh did not see corruption. St. Peter certainly never doubted that David's soul survived. What differentiated the case of Christ was that, whereas the body of David saw corruption, the Body of Christ did not. What had happened in the case of Christ was the conquest of death and the grave. It has been argued sometimes that Resurrection in the case of Christians does not require the restoration of the corpse, neither therefore is it required in the case of Christ. But that objection transfers a purely modern idea of Resurrection back to the age when the Apostles lived. We may be perfectly certain that for a Jew of the first century the emptiness of the grave where the dead Christ lay was absolutely indispensable to the Apostles' belief in His Resurrection. If the foul engendered worm had fed upon the flesh of our Anointed One, the belief that He had conquered death would have been for our Lord's Jewish contemporaries utterly impossible.

II

After the evidence for the empty grave follows the evidence for the appearances of the Risen Lord.

The earliest evidence for the appearances is the list given by St. Paul to the Corinthians. In that list, written probably in the year 55, St. Paul refers back to the time when he taught the Resurrection to the Corinthian people—*i.e.*, about A.D. 50. Indeed, he refers much further back, even to the time when he himself had received these facts—that is, from the original Apostles. Now if, as seems probable, his conversion took place a year or two after the Ascension, the evidence here given is the evidence of the Church at Jerusalem within two years of the event. The list which St. Paul has given looks like a list officially composed, for it consists exclusively of the evidence of men, whereas the Gospel gives ample place to the evidence of women. The Church already at a very early date enumerated the chief appearances of the Risen Lord.

The nature of the appearances is peculiarly significant. The Resurrection attributed to our Lord is not a return to life under earthly conditions. The Lord's Body is possessed of new capacities. It is the Body that He formerly possessed, yet transfigured and unearthly. He belongs to a higher sphere.

* Acts ii. 29.

The capacity to recognize spiritual realities varies with the individual state. It is only given within the circle of faith. This suggests that a sight of the Risen Lord required preparedness, without which it could effect no spiritual gain.

When we study the appearances of the Risen Lord, the ultimate alternative which has to be faced is—Was it from heaven or of men? In other words, were these appearances supernatural or only natural? Either the cause was Divine—they were acts of self-revelation made by the glorified victorious Son of God—or else the cause was merely human—they were self-generated visions, resulting from human reflection and emotion. That is the ultimate alternative.

1. Those who ascribe the appearances entirely to human self-suggestion represent the experience in such terms as the following:

"As they looked back upon that closing phase they would blame themselves for unresponsiveness, want of understanding, lack of loyalty; if the Master had only still been with them, they would gladly have expressed their sorrow, sought His pardon, assured Him of their love. Thus Jesus was in their thoughts and on their lips. He was with them always, a besetting Presence; and as the days went by, first one and then another of their number—in the end most likely all at once—felt that Presence so intensely, that it projected itself outward, translated itself into visions, convincing them that Jesus was not really dead, but risen."*

That explanation regards the appearances of Christ after death as nothing more than human illusions. There is abundant evidence that illusions have exerted widespread influence over human thought. And it is almost inevitable that critics whose presuppositions exclude the miraculous should regard illusion as the real explanation of the Eastertide appearances. Such critics acknowledge that the Apostles were sincerely convinced that they saw the Lord again, but would deny that these experiences were supernatural, or that God had anything to do with them. It is urged that so long as men believe that a thing is true, the belief will produce the same effect, whether the thing believed is true or not. And the phenomena of hypnotism and auto-suggestion are adduced as illustrations. To this a very able French critic replies:

"A thing that is simply illusion, a mere morbid hallucination, without any true value, can doubtless give rise for a moment to the fullest kind of faith. But such a faith is neither sustaining nor fruitful from the moral point of view. It produces nothing solid. It is not extended over any wide field. It does not

* Warschauer, *The Historical Life of Jesus*, 1927, p. 358.

bring together a great number of souls in a life-giving fellowship; it cannot resist the destructive and solvent action of time."*

There are four elements in the Apostles' belief that they had actually seen the Risen Christ which confirm the conclusion that their experience was not an illusion. First, the extraordinary change that passed over them between Good Friday and Easter Day: a helpless, unnerved, depressed, demoralized group was transfigured into a condition of confident certainty and overwhelming joy. Secondly, a very memorable revolution had taken place in their religious convictions. Traditional inherited beliefs about death and crucifixion had been exchanged for principles which up to that time they could not have accepted. Thirdly, this amazing alteration in their whole religious outlook on life, both emotional and intellectual, this living certainty that they had seen Him and heard Him speak, was not a transitory condition. It lasted in undiminished strength to the very latest moment of their lives. Its reality was put to the severest tests of privation and of pain that human opposition could inflict; but the bitterest experience had not the slightest power to weaken the force of their conviction about what they had seen and heard. Fourthly, to all this must be added the singularly impressive fact of St. Paul's staking the very existence of Christian religion on the reality of our Lord's Resurrection. That argument would be impressive even if it was found for the first time in the pages of a modern apologist. But the occurrence of this challenge, deliberately and relentlessly reasoned out to its final conclusion by the first and greatest of Christian missionaries, reveals a firm intellectual conviction that the Resurrection of Christ could bear the weight of all that they had rested upon it.

The consequence is that numberless critics have been convinced that no explanation is adequate which ascribes the Apostolic Easter experience simply to human agency, to self-generated visions, making them mere products of reflection, emotion and remorse, and leaving God entirely out. As the German critic Keim said years ago, nothing less than Divine intervention can account for the facts. What Keim called a " telegram from heaven was necessary after an earthly downfall which was unexampled. The evidence that He was alive was therefore given by His own impulsion, and by the Will of God."†

Explanations of this kind have been given by a number of writers since.

Some recent critics are not prepared to allow that the Risen Christ appeared " in visible form " or " with audible voice "

* G. le Roy, *Dogme et Critique*, 224; *Grandmaison*, 197.
† *Jesus of Nazara*, vi. 364.

to His disciples. Their opinion is that there was no appearance at all from *outside*, no external impression upon the senses of the Twelve, but that there was an *inward* stimulus upon the disciples' inner consciousness creating certainty within. "Our Lord having passed into the spiritual sphere acted upon the senses of His disciples from within, the brain-cells being stimulated in such a way as to create the same impressions as would have been caused if a Figure had been presented to their sensory organs from without."*

This theory that our Lord was never seen again by human eyes after His death, and that all that happened was a message divinely sent announcing His triumph, and conveyed to the inner consciousness of His disciples, is the most modern of all the explanations of the Resurrection. The reason why it commends itself to certain recent critics is that it gets rid of all the problems about the empty grave, rendering it a matter of indifference whether the grave was empty or not. It gets rid also of all the problems connected with external and visible appearances of our Lord in bodily form. But it involves setting aside large portions of the Apostolic evidences. It rewrites the concluding chapters of the Gospels. It is certainly not what the evidence is intended to suggest. It also raises the question whether a simplification designed to meet the dominant theories of the age has any finality about it.

Consider one example. St. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles assumes the leadership of the Twelve. He reflects on "the place from which Judas by transgression fell." It is inevitable to ask: Who restored St. Peter himself to his apostleship again? Who authorized the man who by his denying his Lord sank deeper than any other of the Twelve, Judas alone excepted? Was this resumption of leadership merely due to a message privately conveyed to St. Peter's individual consciousness within? Plainly that would not meet what the case requires. If the Risen Lord had visibly appeared to Peter and, in the presence of His brethren, restored him to his place, then his assumption of leadership becomes intelligible. And that is exactly what the evidence relates. Without some such public restoration of St. Peter his calm assumption of leadership over the Twelve becomes inexplicable.

Moreover this theory that communication was established between the Spirit of Christ and the inner consciousness of the Twelve represents our Lord as existing in a bodiless condition in the unseen world. It recognizes nothing more than a survival of the soul. But it is simply impossible to eliminate from Apostolic Christianity the doctrine that in the future life

* *Cf.* Wade, *N.T. Introduction*, p. 481.

a man will not become a disembodied spirit, but will consist of body as well as soul. That doctrine is unmistakably taught by St. Paul. He insists that there is a spiritual body, not only the natural body of our present state. He maintains that if the earthly house, our present bodily frame, be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. The life hereafter is not a bodiless state. What is mortal will disappear. But the spirit will still be clothed. All through the Christian Scriptures the doctrine is maintained that man is not a bodiless spirit, but spirit and body united. In modern phrase body is the organ of self-expression. In the future life the spirit will still possess a body, an organ of communication perfectly adequate to the requirements of spirit. That very thoughtful writer Elmer More reflects that "it is not easy nor even possible to imagine an absolutely disembodied existence."*

Looking back upon the evidence as a whole it is important to avoid over-statement. It must certainly be confessed that the evidence of the Resurrection given in the Gospels is far less, either in quantity or in quality, than the immeasurable importance of the fact leads us to desire. It is a singular thing that the earliest of the Gospels remains incomplete precisely when the critical subject of the Resurrection is reached. Yet it must be remembered that the evidence of the Divine is never overwhelming. There is also an element of confusion in the narratives which was never quite cleared up. Many an attempt has been made to secure a harmony between them. But it cannot be said that any of these attempts have become universally accepted. What may be truly said about the evidence is, that it presents the characteristics of all genuine human evidence; that is to say, substantial agreement under differences of detail.

III

Assent to the evidence for our Lord's Resurrection is certain to be affected by our presuppositions; it is necessary, therefore, to remember how important our presuppositions are. It is probably true to say that no man approaches the events of Easter Day without presuppositions of some kind or other. As the Dean of St. Paul's has said: "There are so-called scientific studies of Christ and of Christianity which are as much vitiated by presuppositions as those of the most hidebound traditionalist." And it is most important to remember, as the same writer adds, that "more dangerous than 'arbitrary' assumptions are 'tacit' assumptions, and it is much to be

* Elmer More, *The Catholic Faith*, p. 110.

wished that those who approach the study of religion or of Christian origins with atheistic or agnostic presuppositions would state the fact at the beginning. We should then be able, as we are in the case of an orthodox Christian writer, to know what kind of criterion of probability or credibility the author brings with him to the evidence."*

There are presuppositions which close the door to evidence, and there are presuppositions which enable a man to keep an open mind.

1. There are presuppositions about the laws of nature. It has, for example, been said that " the reanimation, or the sudden transformation into something not quite material and yet not quite spiritual, of a really dead body, would involve the violation of the best ascertained laws of physics, chemistry, and physiology. Were the testimony fifty times stronger than it is, any hypothesis would be more possible than that."†

This view of the laws of nature as iron uniformity, and invariable identity, was congenial to the nineteenth century. The attitude of the present century is changed. There is less readiness to say that anything is impossible, more readiness to keep an open mind.

The laws of nature belong to the category of working hypotheses, which, indispensable as they are, are liable to ceaseless correction, qualification and extension.

2. There are also the presuppositions of the historian. This is admirably represented, with instructive clearness, by the German historical critic Friedrich Loofs in his reply to Adolf Harnack. History is strictly within the limits of the purely human. " When historians are forced by credible report to recognize a fact as having really occurred, they must assume causes lying within the sphere of our experience." From this it follows that historical science, when investigating the life of Jesus, must assume that it was a purely human life, and that nothing happened in it which falls outside the sphere of human experience. The disciples of Jesus were convinced of His Resurrection. Historical science, therefore, is not only allowed, but also obliged to explain this conviction of the Resurrection of Jesus from causes lying within the sphere of natural human experience. " If historians come to the conclusion that such an explanation is impossible then they must say that history cannot deal with this subject, it belongs to the province, not of history but of religious faith." But as long as a historian does not declare his science to be incompetent, he must look for a natural explanation of the faith of the disciples. " No description of the life of Jesus

* Dean Matthews, in *Modern Churchman*, September, 1936, p. 239.

† Rashdall, quoted by Kirsopp Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection*, 1907, p. 269; Grandmaison, iii., 157.

that recognizes supernatural factors is purely historical." "If the life of Jesus cannot be understood as a purely human one, then . . . to do full justice to his life and his person is beyond its limits." And this, says Loofs, "is my conviction." "Historical science is not able to do full justice to Jesus."

3. There are also the presuppositions of religious belief, of the Theist, of the believer in revelation. The Christian religion is unable to conceive that Deity is excluded from intervention in the Universe which He has created and sustains in existence, or that He has handed over the management of it to a company of the laws of nature. From the standpoint of supernatural religion it is easy to appreciate the irony of a notice said to have been posted on the door of the church of St. Médard in Paris: "Deity is expressly prohibited from working a miracle in this place. By order of the King."* The believer in the Deity of Theistic religion can keep an open mind. To the challenge of Christ—Was it from heaven or of men ?—he is prepared to admit the former alternative.

Finally, the Resurrection of our Lord can never be rightly appreciated if it is separated from our Lord Himself. Its credibility depends on whose Resurrection it is. Resurrection attributed to any other historic figure would not for a moment possess the same credibility. Resurrection is supernatural. It is an act of God. Merely to discuss the problem whether a dead body rose, or whether certain asserted appearances were realities or illusions, without considering whose Body this is, and who is the Person that is affirmed to have appeared, is to leave out of consideration the essential thing on which the credibility of this evidence mainly depends. The ultimate question must always be: Who is this Personality of whom it is declared that on the third day He rose again from the dead ? It is a Personality absolutely unique. There is no parallel in human history to the religious self-consciousness of Jesus Christ, whether about His own character, or His ascendancy over mankind, or about His personal relation to the Eternal Deity as the Only Son. Ultimately faith in the Resurrection of our Lord must depend on what and who He is. It cannot otherwise be essential to the religious hopes and prospects of mankind either here or hereafter. If Christ is the Everlasting Son of the Father, and the Redeemer of the human race, then His Resurrection becomes natural, indeed inevitable. The reality of His Resurrection cannot be separated from the reality of His Incarnation.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

* "De par le Roy. Défense à Dieu de faire miracle en ce lieu." (In Germany it would, no doubt, have been "mit strafe verboten.")

POINTS THAT MAY BE MISSED IN READING THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK

(1) Mark i. 14

The date of the opening of our Lord's ministry is described in Mark (so also in Matt. iv. 12) by the use of a significant Greek verb. The verse is correctly rendered in the Revised Version, "After that John *was delivered up*, Jesus came into Galilee preaching the Gospel of God." There is, however, much more than the statement of a date in this passage. The words are weighty. They announce a mighty development in religious history. "The Gospel of God" is about to be preached, and Jesus with this full Gospel will replace the bare summons to repentance which was the work of John the Forerunner. The Baptist's work is done, and God *delivers up* his servant to death: his death happens by the providence of the Father. The elementary teacher is removed to make way for the perfect teacher, the Rabbi of Rabbis. And John's death is that of a martyr; it has value for ages to come. John is the Forerunner in his death as in his life, for Jesus, too, when his hour was come was *delivered up*.

This is expressly stated in Acts ii. 23. The words are those of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost: "Jesus of Nazareth . . . him, *being delivered up* by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay." The Greek for *delivered up* is ἔκδοτον in this passage, but the significant verb παραδίδωμι appears in this same special sense in the Epistles as well as in the Gospels. Thus in Rom. viii. 32, "Who spared not his own Son, but *delivered* him *up* for us all." Further in 1 Cor. xi. 23 the better rendering (*pace* both R.V. and A.V.) is "The Lord Jesus in the night in which *he was delivered up* took bread." On this verse Dr. A. Plummer (I.C.C.) remarks, "To translate 'was betrayed' confines the meaning to the action of Judas; whereas the Father's surrender of the Son is included, and perhaps is chiefly meant, and the Son's self-sacrifice may also be included." The same Greek verb is used of our Lord's own self-sacrifice twice in one chapter of Ephesians: in v. 2, "Even as Christ also . . . *delivered* himself up for us"; and in ver. 25, "Even as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it." So surely in quoting 1 Cor. xi. 23 in the Communion Office it would be better to expunge the reference to the act of Judas, and rather recall the gracious (if mysterious) surrender by the Father of the Son

to death, and the Son's submission to the Father's Will. And looking back to Mark i. 14 we feel that the intrusion of the words "in prison" (A.V.) is unhappy, and that a greater thought underlies the natural rendering of the Greek—namely, "After John was *delivered up*."

Thus was ushered in the ministry of our Lord. "God buries His workmen, and carries on their work."

(2) Mark ii. 1

Mark ii. 1: Jesus had at the beginning of His ministry a head-quarters or home at Capernaum: "It was noised (*auditum est*) that he was *at home*." So A.V. margin and R.V. margin. The same Greek phrase is used in 1 Cor. xiv. 35, "Let them ask their own husbands *at home*." This correct rendering in Mark ii. 1 lends emphasis to our Lord's words at a later stage, when He was beginning His peripatetic ministry (Matt. viii. 20), "The Son of man hath not where to lay his head." Jesus had known for a brief space at Capernaum what it was to have a home.

(3) Mark ii. 17

Mark ii. 17: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." This, without the addition of the words "to repentance," is the right reading of the Greek, both here and in Matt. ix. 13. Hence the Revised Version omits the additional words. But "to call" (καλέσαι) by itself has a general signification; thus in Matt. xxii. 3, 9 it means "to invite" to a feast. And since our Lord spoke these words when He was sitting at meat with other guests, they are best understood in the general sense, "I came to invite (even) sinners to the banquet of the kingdom of God."

Moreover, it is probable that there is a further reference here, and that the word "sinners" bears a special sense. As used by the Scribes it would include non-Pharisees and even Gentiles (Swete *in loco*). St. Paul, the former Pharisee, uses the phrase "Sinners of the Gentiles" (Gal. ii. 15). There may therefore be a hint here of a coming extension to the Gentiles of the invitation into the kingdom of God, though our Lord's chief mission was to his own people, the Jews (Mark vii. 27). (I return to the subject later in a note on Mark v. 19, 20.)

(4) Mark iii. 5

Mark iii. 5: "And when he had looked round on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it

out: and his hand was restored whole as the other." So according to the Authorised Version runs the story of the cure in the synagogue of the man with a withered hand. Jesus was grieved at the *hardness* of the hearts of those present. But this rendering misses a point in the narrative. Jesus had hard hearts constantly round Him, and He might have been angry and grieved every day. But on this occasion there was a special reason for His anger. A man was present in the synagogue whose withered hand should have called forth the compassion of the congregation. But no compassion was shewn. They took note of the impotent man, and they marked the presence of Jesus; and their hearts actually grew hard as they watched, and they thought, Here is an opportunity of applying a test to Jesus: if He heals on the Sabbath day we can use the act to discredit Him with devout people. A sinful process was taking place in the hearts of the watchers in the synagogue, in the very place in which men gathered to learn of God. What moved Jesus to anger was not the *hardness* but (as the Revised Version gives it) the *hardening* of their hearts at the sight of suffering. The man might continue in his helplessness, or not, but their purpose was to discredit Jesus. And the Lord took note as their hearts *grew hard* even before His eyes.

(5) Mark v. 19, 20

Mark v. 19, 20: "And (Jesus) suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go to thy house unto thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and how he had mercy on thee. And he went his way, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all men did marvel." To see the significance of this passage it is necessary to realize the non-Jewish character of the region of the Decapolis. Dalman in his book on *Sacred Sites** calls it "the federation of the ten cities." "With Scythopolis," he adds, "the federation reached [westward] over the Jordan, a wedge between Galilee and Samaria. With Gerasa and Philadelphia it embraced the east of Jewish Peræa. It formed thus a complete protection to the eastern frontier." Two of these cities, Gadara and Hippos, were assigned by Augustus to the province of Syria.† No one of them was given to the Herods. They were separate from the Jewish parts of Palestine, and their population was Hellenistic. Where their territory touched the Lake of Galilee swine could be kept.

In was then in this Grecized, heathen district that the healed demoniac *at the command of Jesus* began to preach, to publish

* P. 6.

† Josephus, *B. J.*, ii., vi., 3.

the mercy of God bestowed through His Messiah. Yet there are writers who maintain that Jesus had no forward vision of an extension to the Gentiles of the preaching of the kingdom of God. Because Jesus and the Twelve worked intensively on Palestine (Matt. x. 5; xv. 24), the critics cannot believe that our Lord intended that extensive work in the outer world should follow in due course. Surely this is a very narrow reading of words spoken on special occasions.

Jesus adopted a method of work in the highest degree suitable—namely, He first established firmly His headquarters in Palestine among His own countrymen; the extension of His kingdom to the Gentiles in Gentile lands was to follow later. His vision of this extension is seen both before the Passion and after the Resurrection. "The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. xxi. 43). "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19).

(6) Mark vi. 45

Mark vi. 45: "And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before him unto the other side to Bethsaida, while he himself sendeth away the multitude."

Such is the conclusion of the story of the feeding of the five thousand. The Evangelist states in verse 44 that they that ate the loaves were five thousand men, but he plainly feels that something remains to be told. He proceeds to make two further statements which evidently had intense meaning for him, though the meaning is not at once clear to his reader. He is thinking (it seems) like the author of the Fourth Gospel of the effect of this arresting "sign" on the multitude. St. John tells us that the multitude was strongly moved, and that they were about to seize Jesus to make Him king (John vi. 15); for, indeed, the act of Jesus had recalled to them the work of Moses, their captain, in the wilderness. St. Mark, without mentioning the design, tells with emphasis the steps which Jesus took to defeat it. In the first place, He at once dismissed the Twelve. Unlike the usual aspirant for a crown, who calls his friends around him to be his supporters or his bodyguard, Jesus in the sight of the multitude divested Himself of His faithful followers and stood alone. And when He stood alone He simply dismissed the crowd, which certainly would have responded to any appeal that Jesus had thought fit to make. But His kingdom was not of this world. (*Cf.* A. E. J. Rawlinson *in loco.*)

"The multitude." We know in this case that it was indeed what we should rightly call a *multitude* that waited upon Jesus. It was estimated at five thousand men. On many other occasions, when the word "multitude" is given in the Authorised Version for the Greek ὄχλος, "crowd" would be a better rendering. A number of people besetting a small house in Capernaum is called ὄχλος (Mark ii. 4; iii. 20), though the number might be not more than fifty or a hundred. When the Evangelist wishes to signify a real multitude he adds an adjective as in iv. 1, ὄχλος πλεῖστος or in v. 21, 24, ὄχλος πολύς; similarly in the account of the feeding of the five thousand, πολὺν ὄχλον (Mark vi. 34). No ordinary crowd, but a multitude, thousands of "war-like Galilæans,"* were around Jesus, when He feared lest a Messianic seditious movement should arise from the mysterious feeding of five thousand.

(7) Mark vii. 24

Mark vii. 24: "And from thence he arose and went away into the borders of Tyre and Sidon. And he entered into a house, and would have no man know it: and he could not be hid" (λαθεῖν, "escape notice"). What was the meaning of this withdrawal from the Holy Land into a heathen land? It was an act open to an evil construction, such as the early anti-Christian writer Celsus would no doubt have put upon it. Celsus, as reported by Origen, says that "Jesus attaching to Himself ten or eleven infamous persons, publicans and sailors of the worst kind, took to flight hither and thither with these, shamefully and greedily gathering scraps of food" (Origen *contra Celsum*, i. 62). In closer touch with the evangelic narrative is the comment of Gustav Dalman, "When His wanderings took Him beyond [the frontiers of His own country] to the further shores of the Galilæan lake, it was due to His desire to escape notice, to avoid the domain of Herod Antipas [who had killed the Baptist], and also to be alone with His disciples, to woo them from other distracting influences and to dedicate Himself entirely to them" (*Sacred Sites*, p. 198).

In one aspect our Lord's journey was a flight, but it is better described as a withdrawal, as Dalman represents it. His hour was not yet come. His training of the Twelve was not yet finished. He was waiting on the Will of the Father. In short, our Lord's journey illustrates His own declaration preserved in John iv. 34, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me and to accomplish his work." On the rendering "accomplish" (so R.V.) Bishop Westcott remarks: "The original word

* Josephus, *Bell.*, iii., 3, 2.

(τελειώσω) is remarkable. It expresses not merely 'finishing,' 'bringing to an end,' but 'bringing to the true end,' 'perfecting.'" (*Cf.* A. E. J. Rawlinson *in loco.*)

(8) Mark ix. 30, 31*a*

Mark ix. 30, 31*a*: "And they went forth from thence, and passed through (παρεπορεύοντο) Galilee; and he would not that any man should know it. For he taught his disciples . . ."

The passage which begins thus is of great interest (ix. 30-50). It says that our Lord devoted the time during which He passed through Galilee to teaching His disciples, and it shews also how greatly they needed some of His elementary lessons. He was trying to communicate to them the coming tragedy of His career, and they were quarrelling over the spoils of an expected earthly triumph. James and John were shortly to be asking for the first two places in the coming kingdom (Mark x. 35-45). The disciples generally, and not these two only, found the lesson of the humiliation and death of King Messiah the Son of David very hard to learn (Mark xi. 9, 10).

The whole subject of our Lord's teaching, its content and its application to the needs of the audience to which it was addressed is of the highest interest. He taught the multitudes by parables and by parabolic sayings—*i.e.*, by attractive half-veiled teaching intended to arouse attention and to provoke to further inquiry. He did not give these casual assemblies the specially adapted lessons that He gave to the small groups (of Twelve or more) of His associates. The "Disciples," strictly so called, were taken into confidence and prepared by intimate lessons for the office of Apostles and Teachers. Of this process there are many notices in Mark. Parables and dark sayings were explained to them (Mark iv. 10 *ff.*; vii. 17 *ff.*; ix. 28 *f.*); warnings against false teaching were given them (Mark viii. 15 *ff.*); a selected few, Peter, James, and John, were given the special lesson of the Transfiguration (Mark ix. 2 *ff.*). And so for the interpretation of Christ's great sayings the composition of His audience must be taken into account. The Sermon on the Mount (it must be remembered) was addressed in the main to "His disciples" and not to the multitude (Matt. v. 1, 2, "He . . . *taught* them, saying . . .").

(9) Mark ix. 39, 41

"Jesus said, . . . Whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink because ye are Christ's (ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ: Greek, 'in name that ye are Christ's'), verily I say unto you,

he shall in no wise lose his reward." Some expositors doubt if Jesus Himself could have used the phrase, "because ye are Christ's." Above, in ver. 31, our Lord speaks of Himself as "Son of man," and this of course is according to His usage as given by St. Mark. Swete and Rawlinson (both *in loco*) remark that the parallel phrase in Matt. x. 42 ("in the name of a disciple") is "perhaps" ("probably") "nearer to the original." But on the other hand the use of Χριστοῦ is apposite here. Our Lord had recently accepted from St. Peter the confession, "Thou art the Christ" (Mark viii. 29). It is true that He wished the matter of the confession to be kept secret for the present. But in the first place, in Mark ix. 41 Jesus is speaking "in the house," in private with His disciples, and, secondly, He is speaking with authority. He speaks as the king looking forward to the giving of rewards in the kingdom. The gift of the cup of water is a sign of acknowledgment of Messiah and of His reign, and it is not to be allowed to miss its reward.

(10) Mark xiii. 10

Mark xiii. 10: "And the Gospel must (δεῖ) first be preached to all the nations."

In the second half of the nineteenth century there was much writing and much talk about the second coming of our Lord. Preachers preached about it, and writers, in spite of our Lord's warning, tried to calculate from some dark sayings, specially in the Old Testament, the date of the event. Mark xiii. 10 was cited, and once I was told that a certain preacher informed his congregation that the end must be very near, for a friend of his had just preached the Gospel to the last of the nations to hear it. This astounding statement was surely due to a complete misreading of this passage from St. Mark. As reported by the Evangelist, our Lord's words do not give a hint of the date of His second coming; they are of a totally different character. They are an assertion of the duty of the Christian Church to preach the Gospel to the nations, and moreover to preach it without delay before the Lord returns to see how His command has been carried out. The words, "The Gospel must be first preached," have a parallel in Acts i. 6-8. There the Apostles ask, "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" but Jesus puts aside the question, and tells His disciples not what to think, but what *to do*. "Ye shall be my witnesses . . . in Jerusalem . . . and unto the uttermost part of the earth." In Mark it stands, "The Gospel *must* be preached." The word here translated *must* (δεῖ) expresses duty: it is used many times in the Gospels, and usually, if not

always, of *moral* necessity. So in John ix. 4, "We *must* work the works of him that sent me while it is day," and in Luke xxiv. 26, "*Behoved it* (ἔδει) not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?" Acts xix. 21, "I must (δεῖ) also see Rome." There are many other equally telling instances, though the significance of the "must" does not always spring to the eye.

W. Emery Barnes.

ST. PAUL'S CONVERSION IN HIS EPISTLES

Religious experience is a mystery; and it remains mysterious both to those who undergo it, and to those who seek to interpret the experience of others. But the results of such experience are often definite and unequivocal, and the nature of the cause may be deduced legitimately from its effects. In the history of Christianity, there is no individual religious experience which has had more potent results than the conversion of St. Paul, and there is no experience which has been more closely examined by investigators. Yet it is open to doubt whether this investigation has always followed a sound method. In such a case the first step must be to determine, as precisely as possible, what the subject of the experience thought about it himself. We may regard the conversion as an event of supreme importance in the history of the early Church, or as the classic example of religious transformation; but, however we may seek to examine it, our starting-point ought to be St. Paul's own view of the crisis in his life. Let us attempt to deal with this one aspect of the problem: What did St. Paul himself think about his conversion?

At first sight, it does not appear difficult to answer our question by reference to the Acts of the Apostles. In this work we have three records of the conversion (Acts ix., xxii. and xxvi.) which agree in their central features, and which must depend ultimately on the testimony of Paul himself. These are the accounts with which we are all familiar, and to which our minds turn at once when the subject is mentioned. Yet it may be questioned whether this is the right method of approach, because the book of the Acts is a secondary authority for the life and teaching of Paul, whereas we have in his own letters a primary authority. This distinction is of paramount importance.

When we come to investigate an event in the past, for which the evidence is contained in written sources, we find that our

authorities are of two types, primary and secondary. The primary authorities are the documents written by the actors in the drama, and the secondary authorities are the histories composed at a later date, usually, but not inevitably, by non-participants in the events. Thus for the conspiracy of Catiline in 63 B.C., the *Bellum Catilinæ* of Sallust is a secondary authority, while the four speeches of Cicero "in Catilinam," speeches actually delivered during the crisis, are primary. Or again, to take an example from our own time, for the battle of Loos in 1915, the narrative of Mr. Cruttwell is a secondary authority,* while the diary of Sir Douglas Haig is primary.† The same distinction holds good, of course, in the study of the lives of individuals. For the life of Julius Cæsar, for example, the biography of Plutarch is a secondary authority, and the *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* are primary. And when we pass from ancient to modern times, we find that for the life of Newman at Oxford, to take a relevant example, we have secondary authorities in the *Oxford Movement* of R. W. Church and the *Oxford Apostles* of Mr. Geoffrey Faber, but these are based on the evidence of the Cardinal's own writings, the *Apologia* and the *Letters and Correspondence*,‡ which are primary. So it is with the life and teaching of Paul. For that subject the book of the Acts is a secondary authority, and the surviving letters of the man himself are a primary authority.

To say this is not, of course, to deprecate the high value of Acts. The book contains the only systematic account we possess of the years of the apostle's greatest activity as a Christian missionary, and it was certainly the work of a contemporary, who had himself shared in the labours of his hero. But the fact remains that Acts as we have it was written at least twenty years after the last of the events which it describes, and that it is not strictly a biography of Paul, but a history of the progress of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome. If Acts were our only authority for Paul, we should be in much the same position in regard to his life as we are in regard to the life of Jesus. For the life and teaching of our Lord, we have in the surviving Gospels only secondary authorities. If we possessed primary authorities, we should have, for example, a letter written by Jesus to John the Baptist, describing His rejection by the religious leaders in Galilee; or a letter written to Joseph of Arimathæa after the Transfiguration, explaining His decision to come up to Jerusalem for the Feast which He knew would

* C. R. M. F. Cruttwell, *A History of the Great War*, 1914-1918. Oxford, 1934. Pp. 161-69.

† Extracts from the Diary, together with a letter written at the time, are contained in Duff Cooper, *Haig*. London, 1935. Pp. 254-76.

‡ Edited by Anne Mozley. London, 1891.

be fatal. It is needless to point out how highly we should value such documents if we had them in the case of Jesus; and the analogy is instructive, because it does bring home to us that these are precisely the documents which we have in the case of Paul. The actual letters written by the man himself are surely a primary authority of the utmost historical importance for the understanding not only of his teaching but also of his life.

It may be argued, however, that while this is true of his life as a missionary, it is not true of his conversion. In his letters the apostle does not give any sytematic account of his conversion, such as we find in Acts. He alludes to it only in one or two places in an incidental fashion, and in several of these passages the reference to the conversion is by no means certain. But this does not undermine our argument in favour of the authority of the Epistles. It remains true that, however valuable may be the witness of another, it cannot compare in importance with anything which the man himself has written on the event in question. The process of literary production, even when it is accomplished by means of dictation, involves a clarification of thought, and a search for words in which to give it the most adequate expression possible. Paul's own allusions, fragmentary as they are, must be regarded as our main source of information on the significance of the supreme crisis in his life.

It has often been noted that these allusions are few and far between. There are only four passages in which the reference to the conversion is direct (Gal. i. 15-16; 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 8; Phil. iii. 12), and there are two further passages (2 Cor. iv. 6 and Eph. iii. 3) in which the reference is probable but not certain. This list may appear to be incomplete, but we exclude from the discussion the evidence of the Pastoral Epistles, because their authenticity is doubted by many scholars. Nor shall we attempt to deal with the description of inward dissatisfaction found in Rom. vii. 1-25. This passage is probably autobiographical, and it may well refer to the apostle's state of unrest during the last stage of his life as a Pharisee. We leave it out because it is concerned, not with the conversion proper, but with its antecedents. It would find a fitting place in any study of the psychological mechanism of the conversion, but it is not strictly within the scope of our present subject.

We turn, therefore, to the six passages which we regard as relevant. We have referred to these passages as allusions, and the description is correct, because in each case the reference to the conversion is introduced incidentally. In Gal. i. Paul is proving that his commission as an apostle did not come

from man, and is therefore not inferior to that of the other apostles. In 1 Cor. ix. he is laying down the general principle that "all things are lawful, but all things are not expedient." He himself possesses the full apostolic rights and privileges to which he is entitled by his position as one who had seen "Jesus our Lord," but in accordance with his principle he does not choose to exercise them. In 1 Cor. xv. he is giving teaching on the Resurrection in view of difficulties felt by his correspondents, and he mentions the appearance of the risen Jesus to himself along with His appearance to others, in order to assert that belief in the Resurrection was an essential article of the Gospel. In Phil. iii. he is telling of his own personal surrender to Christ, in order to shew that in contrast with his opponents he is free from self-seeking motives. Finally, in 2 Cor. iv., he is shewing that the glory of the ministry of the new covenant surpasses that of the old; and in Eph. iii. he is expounding the nature of the mystery revealed through the Church for proclamation to the world.

This absence of any definite account of the conversion is certainly significant. It demonstrates that, on the basis of the surviving records, Paul was not interested in the details of the experience. He was free from the morbid introspection of the religious egocentric; he was not concerned to analyze his own reactions to the crisis with which he had been faced. This is not to say that he was silent on the subject. The evidence of Acts—whatever view we take of the speeches—certainly indicates that the conversion must have been a regular feature in Paul's preaching. The form in which the story appears in Acts—with close agreement in the central features combined with considerable diversity in detail—shews beyond all doubt that it represents a tale which was often told, and which had become in some degree stereotyped in the telling. We may suggest with every confidence that this view will be confirmed when the application of the *formgeschichtliche* method is extended from the Gospels to the Acts. This evidence is in entire accord with the general probability that Paul would regard his conversion as apologetic material of high evidential value. He would speak of the power of God in Christ, and as proof of that power, he would tell how he had been brought to believe in Jesus not only without his co-operation, but also in direct contravention of his desires.

But, none the less, this is entirely in agreement with the evidence of the Epistles. In the speeches reported in Acts xxii. and xxvi. the apostle is trying to explain how he, a genuine and loyal Jew, became a believer in, and an apostle of, the Messiah who had been rejected by His people. This was a religious

volte-face which certainly called for some explanation, and Paul's explanation is a straightforward appeal to the facts. He shews that the effect has a sufficient cause, but he is in no way concerned with the precise nature of the causation by which the change was brought about. His main interest is not in the cause but in the effect, in the fact that he is at present acting as he does. So it is in the Epistles. His references to the conversion are concerned predominantly with the result rather than the process of change. His conversion was the supreme crisis in his life, because it was the occasion which led him to become a believer and an apostle: a believer in Jesus as the true Messiah or Son of God, and an apostle whose life-work was to propagate this belief. Both in Acts and the Epistles the conversion appears as the event which made him what he was. To that extent his thought about his conversion is absolutely clear and definite; but this unambiguous reference is to the result and not to the precise nature of the crisis in itself.

We may now proceed to examine more closely the actual allusions in the Epistles. The passages are free from serious textual difficulties, but they present several problems of exegesis of which we must take notice in the attempt to estimate their significance. We may begin with the two simplest references, those in 1 Cor. In ix. 1 Paul writes: "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?"* The verb used is one employed to denote ordinary visual perception, and it carries no definite connotation of spiritual or ecstatic apprehension. The sentence is a straightforward rhetorical question, expecting an affirmative answer; and it amounts to an emphatic statement that the writer had seen Jesus. The seeing referred to must have taken place after the Resurrection, because it is regarded, as the context shews, as constituting a valid claim to apostleship. Paul was undoubtedly an apostle, because he had seen the risen Jesus. In the passage in xv. 8 the reference is of the same type. Paul writes: "Last of all, as unto one born out of due time, He appeared unto me."†

The appearance of the risen Jesus to himself is here equated with the appearances to the other witnesses of the Resurrection, and it is this series of appearances which constitutes the apostleship of those to whom they were vouchsafed. In this second passage the occasion is described in terms of the action of the risen Jesus, who appeared, in contrast with the former passage, where the emphasis is laid on the action of the apostle, who beheld. Thus the two passages are identical in meaning: they

* οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἑόρακα;

† ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὤφθη κἀμοί. (The text quoted is that of Westcott and Hort.)

are two ways of saying the same thing. The risen Jesus appeared, and Paul saw Him. The conversion in these passages is regarded as something which took place in the past on the plane of actual concrete experience. It was an historical event.

Paul saw the risen Jesus, who appeared to him. But we may be tempted to raise the question, Did he regard the appearance as objective or subjective? Did he think that Jesus appeared in flesh and blood before his bodily eyes, or that He appeared as a spirit before his faculty of inward apprehension? We cannot answer this question in terms of the precise antithesis in which we have stated it. There can be no doubt that Paul (like the earliest believers as a whole) looked upon the first appearances of the risen Jesus as standing in a class by themselves. They were made with the object of convincing them that Christ was alive and glorified, and they came to an end with the Ascension. Paul is aware of the distinction in point of time between the appearances to the original believers and the appearance to himself. The latter was "last of all, as unto one born out of due time" (1 Cor. xv. 8). He admits by implication that this appearance took place after the Ascension, but he implies beyond any doubt that it was of the same character as the appearances to the others, which proved that the Lord had risen. Moreover, we may note that Paul nowhere refers to this experience as one of the "visions and revelations of the Lord" which were granted to him (2 Cor. xii. 1-10). It is true that in Acts xxvi. 19 he is represented as referring, in the speech before Agrippa and Festus, to the conversion as "the heavenly vision"; but we are by no means certain that the speech reproduces his *ipsissima verba*, and this single phrase cannot be held to imply a view of the conversion as a visionary experience.

Finally, we may certainly lay down that the distinction between objective and subjective experiences was not consciously present in Paul's mind. It would have been strange to the mind of any man of ancient times, because it is one which has been formulated in modern days as a result of the progress of the physical sciences. While it is of the highest practical importance, it may be doubted whether it is of great value in the interpretation of religious experience. For the religious mind (as Professor John Baillie has pointed out*), the important distinction surely is not that between the objective and the subjective, but that between the significant and the illusory. Paul would have understood the latter distinction (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 1-3), and he would have certainly placed his conversion in the category of significant experience. It was as real to him as his own existence.

* John Baillie, *And the Life Everlasting.* Oxford, 1934. P. 155.

Let us now pass to consider three passages where the conversion is referred to in another way: Gal. i. 15-16, Phil. iii. 12, and Eph. iii. 3. In Galatians the apostle is writing, as we have seen, in defence of his apostleship, and he is recounting his connection with the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem, in order to assert both their friendly approval of his work and his independence of their guidance at the beginning of his career as a Christian. He refers to " the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through His grace to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles."* We shall have to come back to this passage in another connection, but for our purpose at present the important words are, " God . . . who called me . . . to reveal His Son in me." On the face of it, this phrase describes a mystical experience. God was the prime mover in the process of conversion, and God did His work in Saul's inner man, in his mind and heart, by revealing His Son to his spiritual apprehension. The revelation was conveyed not merely to him but in him.

It has been held, however, by exegetes of the highest distinction, that in this passage there is no reference to a mystical experience. Lightfoot, for example, in his commentary on Galatians,† considers that Paul is speaking of three stages in his consecration to his ministry. There is, first, his predestination to his high office, which dated from before his birth (" God who separated me "); second, his conversion and call to apostleship (" . . . and called me through His grace "); and, third, his entering upon his ministry in fulfilment of the call (" . . . to reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him "). On this view, " in me " means, not a revelation made inwardly to himself, but a revelation made through him to others.

This exegesis, however, will not stand against the damaging criticisms of Lagrange and Burton (to name only two authorities).‡ The former argues that the phrase " to reveal His Son in me " does not imply the bestowal of a third benefit in addition to predestination and conversion or call. The words must refer quite definitely to the experience of conversion, because it would be tautology to say that God revealed His Son *through* Paul in order that Paul might preach. The apostle's preaching of Christ (and the life which that involved) constituted the revela-

* ὅτεν δὲ εὐδόκησεν (ὁ θεὸς) ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

† J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.* Seventh Edition. London, 1881. Pp. 82-83.

‡ M. J. Lagrange, *Epitre aux Galates.* Paris, 1936. Pp. 13-15.

Ernest De Witt Burton, *The Epistle to the Galatians.* (International Critical Commentary.) Edinburgh, 1921. Pp. 48-53. See also pp. 408-10 and 433-35.

tion of Christ through him. Burton, in like manner, argues decisively in favour of the same view. (1) He points out, to begin with, that the problem cannot be solved by considering the force of the preposition "in," in the phrase "in me." The phrase "ἐν ἐμοὶ" can mean nothing else than "in me." But it may represent in the mind of the writer either the thought "within me," with no reference to any effect upon anyone else; or the thought "in my case," and thus, by implication, "by means of me to others." The use of the preposition does not enable us to decide between these two meanings. (2) He goes on to shew that the verb "reveal" (ἀποκαλύπτω) usually denotes a subjective revelation to an individual mind, and therefore it would be applied naturally, not to the public manifestation of Christ through the ministry of Paul, but to the private revelation of Christ to the apostle. These linguistic arguments are supported by more general considerations. (3) The revelation as defined in this passage must be the third stage in the apostle's preparation for his public proclamation of Christ. Such a proclamation would naturally be preceded by some sort of inward revelation of the Christ who was to be preached. A manifestation of Christ, as Lightfoot thinks, "in him" in the sense of "through him to others," could hardly have the preaching for its purpose, because it is itself practically identified with the preaching. (4) Moreover, in ver. 12, Paul states that he received his gospel by means of a revelation of Jesus Christ. The similarity of the terms used and the close connection of the thought make it probable that the reference in ver. 16 is to the same definite event as that in ver. 12. (5) And, finally, it may be noted that the whole subject of the paragraph is not how Paul made known his Gospel, but how he received it. To pass in one phrase from the manner of its reception to the method of its proclamation would involve an impossible digression from the main theme of the passage. There can be no reasonable doubt that these careful and temperate arguments will carry conviction to the majority of readers, and that they dispose of the view that the words "in me" mean "through me to others." The phrase means "within me," and refers to an individual or subjective revelation granted to the apostle. Paul is referring to an inward spiritual experience, and he naturally uses what we should call the language of mysticism.

A similar type of expression is found in Phil. iii. 12.* In this passage he sets out his own version of the paradox of the religious revelation. In one sense he has already attained all

* οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον ἢ ἤδη τετελείωμαι, διώκω δε εἰ καὶ καταλάβω ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήμφθην ὑπὸ χριστοῦ (Ἰήσοῦ).

that aspiration can desire, because he has gained Christ (iii. 7-9). But yet his attainment is imperfect—the goal still lies ahead—so he is still eager to " press on, if so be that I may apprehend." The verb translated " apprehend " (καταλαμβάνω) means simply to seize or grasp; but even so, the sentence as it stands in the Greek is not entirely free from ambiguity. In the text of the Revised Version it is rendered: " If so be that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus "; while in the margin is given the alternative translation: " If so be that I may apprehend, seeing that also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus." In the first version St. Paul states the object which he wishes to apprehend; in the second version he states the reason for his desire to apprehend. In the first case he tells us what he wishes to grasp; in the second case he tells us why he wishes to grasp. The first version is undoubtedly the more difficult. He indicates the object of his apprehension (" that for which also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus ") in an obscure circumlocution, and this object appears to be something other than Christ Himself. But the whole tenor of the passage indicates that the object of his aspiration is simply Christ Himself. He seeks to " gain Christ " (iii. 9), and for Him, " for the excellency of the knowledge " of Him, he has counted all things to be loss (iii. 8). The goal, which is " the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus " (iii. 14), is surely nothing other than Christ Himself. He is Himself both the ultimate Object of pursuit, and the Agent through whom the call to effort comes.

We may note in passing that the attribution of a twofold function to Christ is entirely in accordance with the apostle's thought elsewhere. In Ephesians, for example, Christ appears both as the Divine Agent in whom and through whom God's purposes of human creation and redemption are carried out (ii. 10, v. 25-27), and as Himself the final Consummation in whom all things are to be summed up (i. 10). Hence, in considering the ambiguous words in Philippians, we shall probably be wise to explain them in accordance with the general sense of the passage and of the apostle's thought elsewhere. We shall therefore accept the second of our two renderings, and read, with the margin of the Revised Version, " I press on, if so be that I may apprehend, seeing that also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus." Paul wishes to grasp, because he has been grasped by Christ.

For our present purpose, of course, these are the important words: " I was apprehended by Christ Jesus." The use of the aorist in this passage denotes a definite occasion in past time, and the context makes it clear that this occasion was none other than the conversion. He says that he was grasped or

seized by Christ, and this grasping or seizing must, of course, be an inward and spiritual act. This is implied by the use of the same verb in both parts of the clause. He is to grasp his ultimate destiny as Christ grasped him. Is it too much to suggest that the object which he is to grasp is nothing other than Christ Himself in His fulness? Whatever may be the precise thought in the apostle's mind, there is no question that he speaks of some action in the sphere of inward and spiritual relations; in other words, of something mystical. "I was grasped by Christ Jesus," he says. Christ Jesus laid hold upon him in an inward and intimate experience. In this passage, therefore, the experience of conversion is described in the same way as in Gal. i., but from a different angle. In Galatians the emphasis is laid upon the action of God, who revealed His Son to Paul. In Philippians the emphasis is laid on Christ, who Himself took hold of Paul. In Galatians God makes Christ known to Paul in the sphere of spiritual apprehension; in Philippians Christ lays hold upon Paul in the sphere of mystical communion. Hence this passage is perhaps the most intimate description of the action of the risen Christ upon the apostle. The conversion is envisaged as a mystical experience in which the initiative was taken by Christ in person, who made a successful assault upon the stubborn spirit of His persecutor. The motive of the Divine action and the energy which enabled it to succeed were nothing other than the Divine Love.

Before leaving the passages of this type, we may take note of the reference in Eph. iii. 3, "how that by revelation was made known unto me the mystery."* The mystery so made known to Paul is described in the same passage as "the mystery of Christ" (iii. 4), and the precise content of this mystery is the fact that through Christ salvation is offered to Gentiles as well as Jews (iii. 6-8). Here the aorist indicates that the reference is to a definite act on the part of God, and the linguistic parallels to passages definitely referring to the conversion (Gal. i. 16; Rom. i. 1-2) make it probable that here also the reference is to the same event. If this is correct, we can class this passage as one in which the conversion is regarded as a mystical experience, and this is borne out by the use of the words "revelation" and "mystery." But it was an experience which (in this passage) was primarily noetic in character. The conversion was the occasion in which Paul apprehended the spiritual truth which God wished to convey to him.

We have now reviewed two types of references to the conversion, and hitherto we have considered it as an isolated incident or event. But Paul did not look upon it in that way.

* (ὅτι) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον.

He linked it in his own thought both with his past life and with the general purpose of God. It was a definite stage in the working out of a plan divinely ordained. This aspect of the matter is dealt with in the passage in Galatians (i. 15-16), which we have already considered from another angle. In that passage the apostle writes: "But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through His grace, tō reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." We have already seen that phrase. "When it was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him among the Gentiles," is a reference to the experience on the Damascus road. Our purpose now is to determine the relation to this event of the divine acts also referred to in the sentence.

The apostle writes, "When it was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal His Son in me." A rendering of the Greek which would bring out the construction of the clause would be: "When God decided (God who separated me even from my mother's womb and called me through His grace) to reveal His Son in me."* The phrases we are considering are parenthetical and are in apposition to "God," the subject of the verb "decided." The question then arises, How does Paul envisage the relation in point of time between the three divine actions to which he refers? God separated him, called him, and revealed His Son in him. There is no difficulty, of course, with the first act, that of separation. God separated him even from his mother's womb. We may note in passing that this phrase probably means, from before his birth. It is a Hebraic expression used in the Old Testament of Samson (Judg. xvi. 17), Isaiah (Isa. xliv. 2), and in the New Testament of John the Baptist (Luke i. 15). We should naturally use some such phrase as "from birth" or "from infancy." But the Hebrew mind delighted to dwell upon the action or influence of God not only in connection with the generation and conception of its religious personalities (such as Isaac, Samson, and Samuel), but also in connection with their pre-natal existence (*cf.* Jer. i. 5 and Luke i. 41). Paul himself in Romans refers to the "purpose of God according to election" as working on Jacob and Esau before their birth (Rom. ix. 10-13). Hence it is probable that when he speaks of himself as separated "even from my mother's womb" he is thinking of a gracious act of God which took place at the earliest possible stage of his existence. He was "separated unto the gospel of God" (Rom. i. 2) even before his birth.

* ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν (ὁ θεὸς) ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψαι τον υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί.

The relation of the call to the other divine actions presents a problem which is probably insoluble. It certainly took place, as we have seen, after his separation; but what is its relation in point of time to the revelation of the Son? As we have seen, both the clauses in question are parenthetical, and are in apposition to the subject of the verb "was pleased" (εὐδόκησεν). They are closely associated grammatically, the participles being under one article and connected by the preposition "and." The fact that they are in the aorist would imply that both refer to actions anterior in point of time to the verb "reveal." The content of the first phrase (separation) makes this certain, but the case of the phrase concerning the call is doubtful. It is probable, however, that the call cannot be regarded as a divine act distinct in point of time from the conversion. In the parallel passage in Rom. i. 1, the apostle speaks of himself as "called to be an apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God." A comparison of this passage with Galatians suggests that his call to apostleship was an aspect of his experience of conversion, rather than a divine act distinct from it. From the point of view of grammar, the clause concerning the call is subordinate to that concerning the revelation of the Son. But from the point of view of exegesis, it is probable that the phrase "to reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him among the Gentiles" is an explanation of the nature of the divine call referred to in the previous clause. The call was a call to apostleship and the apostleship was to be exercised primarily among Gentiles.

This line of interpretation is in accordance with the other references to the conversion in the Epistles. In these passages the call to the Gentile mission is definitely connected with the supreme crisis. In the passage we are considering, the whole object of the divine actions which played upon Paul was that he might preach Christ among the Gentiles. In the passage in Ephesians which we have already noticed, the mystery revealed to Paul is the inclusion of the Gentiles within the scope of the divine plan, and from a mention of this revelation he passes at once to an assertion of his own vocation to make it known to the Gentiles (Eph. iii. 1-9). Moreover, in the opening verses of Romans, he begins by speaking of himself as "called to be an apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God," and goes on to speak of Jesus Christ as One through whom he received grace and apostleship "unto obedience of faith among all the Gentiles" (Rom. i. 1-5). Hence there seems to be no reasonable doubt that in the apostle's mind the call to the work among the Gentiles was an aspect or part of his experience of conversion. His conversion was not only a change of belief; it was also a change of vocation.

Hence in this passage the conversion is regarded as an act of God. It was the outcome of a decision on the part of God to reveal His Son in Paul in order that Paul might preach Him among the Gentiles. But this decisive act did not stand in isolation; on the contrary, it was one of a series of acts, which together constituted the destiny which God had appointed for Paul. God had chosen him, or set him aside, even from before his birth, to carry out His purpose. When the time was ripe He revealed Jesus to Paul as His Son, and called him to undertake the task of preaching this revelation to the Gentiles. The whole process formed a part of the divine "economy" of human redemption.

A similar type of thought and language is found in the last passage which comes under consideration. In 2 Corinthians St. Paul writes: "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake. Seeing it is God that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge to the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 5-6).* It is not possible to say with absolute certainty that we have a reference to the conversion here; but it is probable that such reference is implied. In chapter iii. of this Epistle St. Paul has been speaking of the glory of the ministry of the new covenant, a glory greater by far than that of the old. In the opening verses of chapter iv. he goes on to assert that the character of his personal work is in keeping with his status. He appeals to the conscience of men by proclaiming the truth openly. The truth is as clear as daylight to all except those whose minds are blinded by their servitude to sin, so that they cannot perceive the light which comes from Christ. Christ is the subject of the apostolic preaching, because he is the image of God, and therefore the source of light and truth. This light comes to man from God through Christ. God Himself, in the Person of Jesus Christ, shone in our hearts, and this gift of light to the faithful of the new covenant is comparable to that of light to the world at the time of creation.

While the reference to the apostle's own experience of conversion is not quite explicit, it probably underlies his language here. He speaks of a revelation, in complete contrast with what had gone before, made to the heart and mind, through the Person of Jesus Christ. He refers to it as the reason for preaching Christ Jesus as Lord (iv. 6). The pronouns are in the first person plural, but the thought of his own individual experience

* *Οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς κηρύσσομεν ἀλλὰ χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν κύριον, ἑαυτοὺς δὲ δούλους ὑμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦν. Ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπών Ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ χριστοῦ.*

may well have been in his mind. If this view is correct, the passage may be taken as an allusion to the conversion of the same kind as that contained in Galatians. The conversion was an act of God, "who shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God"; it was a revelation, as personal as possible, of the "face of Jesus Christ"; and it was a revelation which brought the light of truth to one who had eyes to see. But this revelation was not an isolated act. The gift of light to the apostle at conversion was comparable to, and analogous with, the gift of light to the world at the time of creation. The God who converted him was none other than the God who created the world and all mankind, and therefore (it is implied) his conversion was an act of God which has its place in a divine plan not only for Paul, but for all the world.

In these two passages we have a third aspect of the conversion brought before us. It is first and foremost an act of God. It is described not simply as an appearance or apprehension of Jesus Christ, but as an act in which God was the Agent. And this act was not isolated or arbitrary. It was the second of two acts which together constituted the destiny which God had planned for Paul. God had set him aside from his birth, and then had revealed Christ to him that he might be an apostle. This revelation had come to him as the light of truth amid the darkness of error. The light which shone upon him was as the light which flashed over the dark world at the time of creation, but yet it was invested with an intimate and personal radiance, because it shone from the face of Jesus Christ. His conversion, then, had its place in the divine dispensation, which was being worked out in the development of mankind, by the God who was active both in creation and redemption.

We have examined the four passages in the letters which contain indubitable references to the conversion (Gal. i. 15-16; 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8; Phil. iii. 12), together with two passages in which the reference, while less certain, is probable (1 Cor. iv. 6 and Eph. iii. 3). Let us now gather up shortly the results of our enquiry. We see that St. Paul refers to his conversion in three different ways. It was an appearance of the risen Jesus which he saw; it was an occasion in which Jesus both was revealed to him and also laid hold upon his mind and heart; and it was an act of God Himself performed in accordance with the divine plan. These several ways of reference surely indicate that in the thought of St. Paul there were three aspects of the conversion. It was a historical event: "I have seen the risen Jesus." It was a mystical experience: "I was grasped by Jesus Christ." It was a theological reality: "God, who had set me aside, revealed His Son in me." In these phrases we find the

significance which St. Paul himself attached to his conversion. It was something which took place on the plane of historical fact: it was a definite event in the past just as much as the Last Supper, or the death of Jesus, or the Resurrection. It was also an inner spiritual crisis: it was an occasion in which the action—both of God as Prime Mover and of himself in response—took place in the sphere of his own heart, mind, and will, in the depths of his own personality. It was, finally, not something which he did, but something which was done to him, and done by God. It was a divine act, planned and carried out in accordance with the destiny which God had appointed for him and for the world. Hence, it was at once an historical fact, a mystical experience, and a theological reality. This is the significance of the conversion according to the man to whom it happened; and this testimony is the proper starting-point for investigation.

G. J. Inglis.

THE SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR

As the Catholic faith spreads and Catholic practices become more beloved, it is likely that more priests will be called on to act as spiritual directors to an ever-increasing number of penitents. It is desirable, therefore, that there should be some clear thinking on the subject. What do penitents seek when they come to confession? What duty is the priest expected to discharge? I try to suggest tentative answers to these questions.

First of all, let us distinguish between the priest in his capacity of *confessarius* and the priest as spiritual director. Some people make regular confessions without ever acquiring a spiritual director. The other day I met a woman who used to go up to London two or three times in the year, select a church to which she had never been before, or, at any rate, a priest to whom she had never resorted, make a hasty confession, and hurry away as soon as she had been granted absolution, without ever disclosing anything of her circumstances or asking for any advice. When I enquired whether she would not be happier with a spiritual director of her own, she stared, and said, "I don't know what you are talking about."

I have, of course, no means of knowing whether she was one of a large class of persons or not. Evidently, though, what she thought she needed was a confessor and nothing else. She had sins which she wished to confess; she felt the need of the

grace conveyed through absolution; and there, from her point of view, the matter seemed to end.

Perhaps some priests, busy over a thousand and one urgent parochial duties, with little trust in their own ability to direct souls, would be glad if nothing more were ever asked of them. They rejoice when they are called upon to exercise their priestly functions as confessors, but would prefer to be excused the difficult and delicate task of spiritual direction. I venture to think, though, that, of all the kinds of parish work open to them, the most worthwhile and the most rewarding is that of directing penitents. Nevertheless, unless it is done in the right way, it can be an appalling waste of time. Let no one think that these lines are written in order that nice kind clergymen may encourage pious elderly ladies to come to them and talk endlessly about themselves. *No.*

Spiritual directors may be divided into two classes: those who direct from *outside* and those who direct from *within*.

Imagine to yourself a house where everything is in a muddle, furniture all anyhow, meals served at odd hours, everything at sixes and sevens; and the well-meaning mistress not knowing where to begin to put things straight. Outside, in the garden, is a domestic science expert, who begins to give some directions for remedying this state of affairs. Let us imagine that the expert is so far away that he cannot see through the dusty windows, and has to rely for information on the appeals shouted by the lady inside. He shouts back his instructions; suggests that the windows should be cleaned; comes a little nearer; peeps through; taps on a window, and wishes it were wide open, so that he could get a good look in. Meanwhile the lady rushes about, clearing things up. She raises a great deal of dust in the process. He thinks a time-table would be a good thing, recommends methods, lays down rules, sets up standards. Suppose, however, he had the gift of passing through the door—which the mistress of the house often longs to unbar and cannot—how much more wisely could he direct operations!

So it is with the spiritual directors. The further off they are, the louder they have to shout. The less they see into the individual case, the more they will have to rely on methods, rules, and apparatus. Only the saints have the power to stand, as it were, in the centre of a penitent's soul. Once the director is within the house, a whisper, a gesture, a look, even, is all that is needed by way of command.

When the priest, then, approaches his penitent and hopes to bring order out of chaos, what end has he in view? Must he teach the penitent to avoid specific vices and acquire specific

virtues? Only incidentally. Must he rearrange his life for him, and reorganize all his relationships? Probably not.

The director's duty is to *conduct the soul along the road which leads to union with God.*

That is to say, he is *working in the sphere of the supernatural.* He is helping to build an heavenly habitation. There should be an earthly counterpart, no doubt, but the director will fail, and fail badly, unless all he does is done *sub specie æternitatis.*

Of course, the penitent cannot progress towards union with God without avoiding vices and acquiring virtues, and he will become a better father, husband, doctor, scoutmaster, etc., in the process; but he must *first* fit himself for Eternity. Then, and then only (as we are slowly beginning to understand), will he be fit for Time as well. Do not, however, misunderstand me. I am not saying that directors should expect all their penitents to be mystics and contemplatives. There are many ways of union with God. The Hindus, long before the Christian era, taught union by *work*, by *knowledge*, by *rapturous devotion*, and by *will*, the last being the most esteemed. Of course, the pilgrim who progresses Godward chiefly by way of external good works, must add thereto understanding, affection, and fixity of purpose—the ways of union are named according to the preponderating element (if a mixed metaphor may be forgiven), but not one of the four must be neglected.

The point is this. The priest should see that his penitent offers all his actions to God, and considers that their chief importance lies in their being a means of bringing him nearer to God. It is an excellent thing, of course, when religion makes a man more punctual in the discharge of his duties, more affectionate, more charitable, and so on, but it is essential that he should understand that daily duties, human affection, and good deeds are the means appointed by God for his sanctification, and that through the commonplace he has access to the divine. (I am taking for granted that believers who go to confession are making use of the ordinary means of grace with at least a beginning of insight into their efficacy.) What is wrong with most good people is their earthbound view of Christianity. They seem to think that God became incarnate in order that Utopia might exist in the world. Man was created in order that he might worship and know God, not in order to have a thoroughly comfortable and pleasant life in delightful surroundings. Christianity is not enlightened humanism. The director owes it to his penitent never to allow any confusion of thought on this question. He is dealing with immortal souls, and it is contact with eternity that they need.

If, however, the director is to teach union with God, he

must have some experimental knowledge of it himself. In other words, he must be a man of prayer.

If any priest wishes to know how to equip himself for the task of directing souls, the answer is, he must pray. Prayer is the channel which keeps open the way to God. All the great directors have been men of prayer. The " secret of the Curé d'Ars " is no secret. He came to the confessional from his prayers, his watchings, and his mortifications, and when he left the confessional he returned to them.

I heard a good deal at one time about the wonderful " method " of a well-known director of souls, and happened to ask a fellow-religious of his what this famous method might be.

" I don't think he *has* a method," the religious answered. " It is his life of prayer."

Exactly so.

The wise priest will be more concerned to discern the movement of the Holy Spirit in the heart of his penitent than he will be to try out any theories or ideas of his own. It is all to the good, of course, that the director should be well grounded in ascetic and mystical theology. But however much he may know about mansions, rungs of ladders, stages of union, distinctions made by authorities on acquired and infused contemplation, and so on and so forth, he is bound to go wrong if he tries to apply his knowledge by the light of his own intelligence. If he happens to say the right thing, he will say it at the wrong time or in the wrong way, with the result that his penitent will feel hurried, or alarmed, or complacent, or what not. Much self-restraint is needed on the part of the director to keep himself successfully in the background, to stand aside that the Holy Spirit may act.

A practical enquiry. Should directors furnish themselves with knowledge of the New Psychology? I give a rather donnish answer. If they can, without attaching undue importance to it, there is no harm in their doing so. Freud was undoubtedly a genius, or he would not have set so many clever people disagreeing. But the uses and abuses of the libido had been investigated and classified by Hindu and Buddhist psychologists many hundreds of years before Freud was born, and the Jesuits, shall we say, have not been exactly ignorant either of the passions or the unconscious mind. Freud's work is largely the creation of a vocabulary.

The modern psychoanalyst has elaborated a fairly efficient technique of catharsis, but—as a very successful psychologist said to me not long ago at Cambridge—the science is still in the experimental stage. Psychologists may have learnt how to

eject certain devils from the mind, and even, maybe, to leave the place swept and garnished. Beyond that, they seem to attempt nothing. Certainly the priest should know when to send a penitent to consult a doctor—or on occasions a solicitor—and he *might* find it useful to be able to warn him off psychoanalysts. But to attempt to give treatment when one has no medical training and no expert knowledge of the New Psychology, Freudian or otherwise, would be the gravest folly. The director might very well involve himself in a nervous breakdown, besides playing havoc with his penitent's mentality.

The director ought, on the other hand, to be able to give clear answers to questions on matters of faith.

A friend of mine, a very earnest and thoughtful man, who hoped to seek ordination, went to the vicar of a London church and laid certain doubts before him. The vicar replied, " My dear fellow, don't bother. I have thrown overboard the whole of theology, and pin my faith to *experience.*" Too much dismayed to enquire " Experience of what ?" the doubter hastily withdrew. Perhaps the well-meaning vicar could have told him tales of dazzling experiences, but these would not have met the case when sound doctrine was required.

It is perhaps worth pointing out, though, that a large number of intellectual difficulties arise from misunderstanding what one is expected to believe. For instance, some people say their intellects will not allow them to believe in the Real Presence of our Lord in the sacramental species. When they are told that the *real* is the spiritual, and not the material (which, compared with Pure Being, has only contingent and relative reality), the difficulty vanishes.

Or they often demand evidence when, in the nature of the case, none could be available. The doubter who wants " evidence " for the story of our Lord's temptation would not press his demand if he saw that the only witness one could call would be the devil.

It is, however, of the utmost importance that the priest should recognize the differences between intellectual and spiritual perception. The whole danger of Modernism lies in confusing the two. The Modernist approach is an intellectual approach, and in the intellectual sphere it is highly to be respected. But God is not perceived by the intellect, although He satisfies it. If He were, only theologians would get to Heaven.

The penitent sinking in the ocean of intellectual doubt, and crying that the waves are meeting over his head, can and must be made to understand that our Lord comes to him across those stormy waters, and by grace will hold him up. The more

brilliant and the more thoughtful a man is, the harder it will be for him to humble himself, to pray for faith, and then to wait. It is the business of the director to see that he does it.

A word of warning; and, lastly, one of encouragement.

The bad old days of priestcraft are, we believe, over. You, Father, are in no danger of using the confessional to forward your own ends, or of employing religious blackmail to secure preferment. You may, however, in all good faith, look on the confessional as a legitimate sphere for personal influence.

Consider, then, for a moment. It is an Angel of the Presence, is it not, who is chosen to seal the elect; and no human stamp can be tolerated. However experienced, however wise, however holy you may be, you cannot know the exact pattern to which God wishes each of your penitents to conform, nor can you tell what His verdict on them is. Each soul is to reproduce some aspect of the Christ-life, but not your idea of what the Christ-life is.

Once the teacher has done his best for his pupil, he stands aside. When the pupil, now a master-musician, takes the instrument and the bow in his hands, and, after long years of drudgery and striving, plays the sonata as it should be played, it is his own rendering that he gives, not his teacher's. The composer and the player are in touch at last, and new beauty illumines an immortal theme.

The best directors see in each of their penitents a potential saint. Why should they not do so ? If you glance down a list of those who have been officially canonized and see kings and peasants, freebooters and shopkeepers, matrons and harlots, theologians and illiterates, children and centenarians there represented, you will understand that no circumstances or temperament are absolute barriers in the way to sanctity. The callow undergraduate, the cheap-looking lady from the beauty-parlour, the tired hospital nurse, the heavy company-director are all alike raw material out of which sanctity can be built up.

Teach them, then, according to the ancient wisdom of St. Benedict, to rise by humility. Once you have a man on his knees, crying from the depths of his heart, " God be merciful to me a sinner," there is no height to which the Almighty may not raise him.

A Penitent.

MISCELLANEA

WHAT IS A SAINT?

If anyone called us a saint we should feel agreeably surprised, not to say flattered, and even the least humble of us would be inclined to waive our claim to the title. And yet in the New Testament the word "saint" is used to denote all those who are trying to live the Christian life. St. Paul frequently uses it in this sense when he is writing to the Christians of a certain church or when he mentions the collection for the "saints." And so in this sense every Christian is a potential saint.

But when we speak of a saint we do not mean the term to be synonymous with Christian, for it is intended to denote outstanding piety. The popular conception of a saint is of someone who is quite literally "awfully" holy. There are still many people who cling to the "stained glass window" idea of a saint as an innocuous negative being. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that a saint is a very positive person and one who expresses his true self rather than repressing it.

A saint was once defined as a man who is always thinking about God. This emphasizes the truth that the saint differs from other men in being God-centred rather than self-centred, but it is nevertheless a most misleading definition. It is quite possible for someone to spend all his time thinking about God and to be nothing more than a religious maniac. It is necessary that the would-be saint should not only think about God, but also think about Him in the right way. Now there is a class of people who spend a great deal of their lives thinking about God in a more or less correct way. They are called theologians. But in these enlightened days no one would assert that the terms theologian and saint are synonymous. It may be that we have grown too tolerant, but we do not place the same importance upon orthodoxy as we find placed upon it by the early Church. In the first few centuries martyrdom and zeal for orthodoxy were the most widely accepted evidences of sanctity. At an early date the monk became the ideal Christian, and virginity was regarded as sacred. But when asceticism became repulsive the more enlightened leaders like Basil realized that the social worker is following a vocation which is at least as Christian as that of the hermit. Thus the way was paved for the more humanitarian ideal of sainthood which is so popular in these days of philanthropy. For it is undoubtedly true that most people are more concerned with performing their duty to their neighbour than with observing their duty to God. This is also the explanation of the slight importance that is attached to orthodoxy as opposed to "good works." The reaction against dogma and organized religion has gone too far, and the danger is that we shall mistake mere philanthropy for Christianity. It is the old problem of the connection between belief and conduct. Quite rightly we refuse to call a man a Christian if he does not live a Christ-like life, but it remains true that worship is our first and most important duty.

Now if we examine the claims of many who are called saints, we shall find that they cannot have earned that distinction for sanctity or even

for good works. St. Cyril of Alexandria shewed remarkable zeal for orthodoxy, but his conduct can only be described as disgraceful. He conducted his controversy with the unfortunate Nestorius in the most unscrupulous manner and even resorted to bribery. He is said to have spent no less than £60,000 on bribes and squandered large sums of money on his nephews. Besides all this he made no attempt to stem the tide of massacre in the Alexandrian Church. But his deeds of violence and bitterness are well attested, and apart from his theological prowess he was less of a saint than the heretic Nestorius.

If violent zeal for orthodoxy is the true mark of a saint, the sanctity of St. Jerome must be beyond dispute. He revelled in controversy and wrote with a "vitriolic pen," indeed some of his writings were so violent that his friends suppressed them. We undoubtedly owe him a debt of gratitude for producing the Vulgate, and it is for this that many people venerate him. But in his own day Jerome was reverenced chiefly for his asceticism. His zeal for monasticism knew no bounds. His violent writings left no room for marriage at all, and many a home was broken up by his passion for converting women to a life of virginity. Even those who deplore his conduct cannot help admiring his zeal. He had the single-heartedness which is characteristic of the saint, but he had not learnt the value of Christian charity.

But the asceticism of Jerome was mild compared to the rigours of the Stylites. These, like the holy men of the East, owed their reputation for sanctity to strange and extremely revolting practices. St. Simon Stylites, who lived on a pillar sixty feet high and only a yard wide at the top, had a putrefied rope embedded in his flesh. Lecky's *History of European Morals* gives an unpleasant picture of the ascetics of this period. They were more like maniacs than saints. Dirt and lice were the chief marks of holiness, and if one could subsist on grass or food that had gone rotten, one's sanctity was indisputable. Today, of course, the psychologist would dismiss all these fanatics as victims of a masochistic complex. But gradually the work of reform won the day, and the hermits were largely replaced by the cenobitical type of monk.

Now we are bound to conclude that neither theological prowess nor zeal for asceticism makes a saint, in spite of the importance that has been placed upon these qualifications in the past. What are we to say of martyrdom? Surely no one can imagine anything more saintly than laying down one's life for Christ? And yet not even the martyr is necessarily a saint. The Christian martyr must be actuated by the purest motives (1 Cor. xiii. 3); if he thinks of his own glory rather than that of God, or dies for some less worthy cause, he is not worthy of veneration. Moreover, mistakes have occurred, for in 1181 the Pope had to protest because the diocese of Lisieux was honouring as a martyr a man who had been killed in a drunken brawl! The case of Charles I. presents peculiar difficulties, but even those who hold no brief for Cromwell must find it hard to regard Charles as a martyr in the Christian sense of the word. One other consideration should be mentioned. The martyrs died for Christ, but the task of the present-day Christian is to live for Christ. Who shall say that ours is the easier duty to perform?

We began by asking "What is a saint?" but we are still without an answer. We have seen several qualities which have been regarded as proofs of sanctity, notably martyrdom, theological prowess (in the cause of orthodoxy), virginity and extreme asceticism. If we traced the

answers to our question that have been given by different people at different times we should find a greater variety of saintly qualities. For the popular conception of a saint is to some extent determined by time and place. Thus in times of persecution the martyr is the perfect Christian. In the age of theological controversy the orthodox theologian is most highly esteemed. When asceticism became the rage the hermit was regarded as the ideal holy man. In this respect the conception of a saint bears some resemblance to the conception of the ideal character. Very different qualities are esteemed by Stoics, Confucianists, Mohammedans and Quakers. Warlike nations will honour the warrior, whereas others may esteem philosophers more highly. The saint is, of course, the ideal character for the Christian, but how many communities are Christian? It is obvious that we can hardly expect the popular idea of the perfect Englishman to coincide with the Christian ideal of saint-hood. The ideal Englishman is incurably Pelagian. This brings us to another point.

Although the Christian conception of saintliness should not vary so widely as does the popular notion of the ideal character, it is inevitable that it should undergo considerable change. It cannot remain static, but apart from that there are the differences of temperament between one race and another, and especially between East and West. Eastern Christianity is speculative whereas the West is more practical. The theologian and the ascetic are more honoured in the East. In the West we are unwilling to call anyone a saint unless he is living the good life. Thus one community will attach the highest importance to a life of contemplation and piety while another will make good works their ideal.

The "stained glass window" conception of a saint has prevailed in England until quite recently. This is clearly the result of Puritan teaching. A religion that was based upon fear and favoured a world-denying ethical system was bound to have a detrimental effect. It repressed life instead of expressing it, and the ideal Christian became a negative and most unattractive person. Unlike the happy St. Francis, who went about seeing good everywhere, the Puritan saint saw only sin. The chief duty of the Christian was to avoid sin, and the saint tended to become a person who didn't do certain things. This conception of Christianity is not yet dead, as an army story will illustrate. The soldiers could make little of a new recruit who seemed so different from everyone else until one of them explained, "He doesn't drink, he doesn't smoke, and he doesn't swear, so he must be religious!"

But Psychology has changed all this. Not only the Puritan but the saint has suffered severely at his hands. The sense of sin is dismissed as a form of neurosis. Any tendency towards asceticism is due to sadism or masochism. His religion is probably a projection by which he tries to overcome his inferiority complex, and his whole life is horribly repressed. The psychologist has only one drawback: he cannot make a saint—he can only destroy one. But this does not mean that all his criticisms are mistaken and groundless. Many of the ascetic "saints" were victims of complexes, and the religion of the Puritans involved a great deal of harmful repression. But today the chief danger is that we shall react too much in the opposite direction. The ideal may be self-expression, but the thing that matters most is whether the self is worth expressing or not. In other words, which self are we going to

express? In many instances the people who say they want to express themselves or "to see life" really mean that they want to sin. But there is a good kind of self-expression, and it should be the aim of the Christian to express his true self—*i.e.*, his spiritual side.

Now each of us is a trinity. We are made up of body, mind, and spirit. If we are going to live rightly there must be complete harmony between these three. If the body rules men become intemperate or lazy. If the mind rules we becomes the victims of pride or doubt. It is only when the spirit rules that the body and the brain can co-operate in real harmony. Each has its proper use and must not be neglected, for each of them can be used to express God. The body and material things should express Beauty. The mind should teach Truth. Our spirit should manifest perfect Goodness. These three divine aspects are closely related as are our three selves, for there is nothing so beautiful or so true as a good character. Moreover, it is only when we learn to harmonize our different desires that we become really free.

The present generation asks for freedom, but they do not understand its meaning. The man who is free to do anything—good or bad—is not really free at all. He is the slave of his whims and fancies. No one is really free until he knows he will always choose what is good. The saint is thus the freest person on earth. He is also expressing his true self to the fullest possible extent and thus he attains what others seek in ignorance.

Thus the true saint finds joy in doing God's will while the rest of us struggle to desire the things that He would have us to do. And it is even argued that the man who does his duty in spite of a strong inclination to do otherwise is the most praiseworthy. But surely the conscientious man falls short of saintliness, though most of us try to attain holiness by our conscientiousness. The attainment of holiness is, like conversion, a gradual process, and all the great saints have been very conscious of their shortcomings. The saint who had reached perfection would have no wish to do anything but God's will. He would still have to struggle with temptation as Jesus Christ had to, but his will would constantly be directed towards good and he would always choose it.

Conversion has often been regarded as a sudden experience, but it has its roots deeply hidden in the past. The process of conversion has been compared to an iceberg capsizing. The ice underneath melts away slowly until it becomes top-heavy and turns over suddenly. So conversion is not such a catastrophic thing as it appears to be. In the case of St. Paul we know that he had been kicking against the pricks of his conscience for some time. It is worth noticing that many of the great saints had remarkable conversions—that is, they belonged to the twice-born type. St. Augustine of Hippo and St. Francis of Assisi are perhaps the most outstanding examples. But in each case we know that their final turning to good had been led up to by preceding struggles. The saints who belong to the once-born type may seem less remarkable, but they are no less holy. Indeed, it may reasonably be argued that the once-born type is more saintly because he usually keeps nearer to God all the time, though it has been said that in Jesus Christ alone were these two types perfectly combined.

The saint, then, is the truly converted Christian. We rightly give the name of saint to men who fall short of perfection because Jesus Christ alone was made perfect through the things that He suffered. Saintliness,

like conversion, is a process, but we call those "saints" whose wills are turned to good. They may have their failures and their shortcomings, but inasmuch as they are guided by God's Holy Spirit they too are holy. The life of ordinary mortals is divided and incomplete, it lacks harmony and is often strangely purposeless, but the essence of saintliness is singleheartedness. The saint is governed by one consuming passion—the love of God. This godly desire destroys all less worthy aims. He is a man who has seen the vision and will be satisfied with nothing less. Christ dwells in him and he in Christ. His every action proclaims this truth. It is seen in his worship and in his daily life. Body, mind and spirit are all infused with Christ's spirit and manifest wholeness. He is a man of such transparent goodness that all take knowledge of him that he has been with Jesus. And because he manifests to the world the Christ who dwells within him he is a saint.

V. A. Holmes-Gore.

BRUNNER'S DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

In his recently translated volume *The Mediator*, Emil Brunner, one of the leaders of the continental dialectical theology, has given us an interesting discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity as it is presented by this powerful school. This is an aspect of so-called "Barthianism" (now an inaccurate term in view of the great differences that have developed between Barth and other dialectical theologians) which has been neglected in English-speaking circles; and a brief statement of Brunner's views, with critical comments, may not be without its value for us.

In this journal it will be unnecessary to do more than recall the fundamental postulates of the crisis-theology, with its insistence on the "once-for-all" revelation of the Word in Christ; its depreciation of "natural religion" and "general revelation"; and its conception of God as the utterly other, the "hidden Deity," to a degree which makes Him unknowable by man apart from this special act of revelation in His Word. Brunner has recently modified his view of natural religion, but in essentials his position remains where it was when *The Mediator* first appeared in German, and our quotations will be from that work, in its English translation.

The doctrine of the Trinity, Brunner maintains, has for its aim the securing of "the unity of God against polytheism, and the reality of the divine revelation in Christ against all mere symbolism." The heart of the Christian religion for him (and here at last he is speaking with Catholic Christianity) is that "God Himself reveals Himself personally in Jesus Christ." There is an identity of the one who reveals and of that which is revealed; this is revelation in the full and real sense of the word. It is this fact of revelation which is the mystery of Christ, and which is also His authority over us. He is Himself not that which is divine (which may be interpreted vaguely and in an immanental sense), but He is God, the Word made flesh. It is our conviction that Brunner's Christology is quite unfortunate; but this is not the point at issue in this paper, and we must accept his statement as given above.

If the fact of the revelation in Christ be taken seriously, Brunner holds, it is essential to stress not merely the identity but also the difference

which is involved. "The divine authority of the revealer is the personal authority of God," making the two identical; yet God the revealer at the same time stands alongside God the revealed, as being the revealer of that which otherwise is not revealed. The doctrine of God, which Brunner maintains follows from this statement of the Christian revelation, is "the exact opposite of intelligent understanding." Rather, it is a warning that "precisely when we take the knowledge of God in Christ as a revelation of God, then first are we seriously faced with the mystery of the revealed God." It is this that the doctrine of the Trinity attempts to state.

Brunner admits that he would not preach the doctrine as *kerugma* (scriptural proclamation); but he holds that it is "a defensive doctrine, which would not have been necessary at all if the two fundamental statements of the Christian Creed had been allowed to stand: God alone can save, and Christ alone is this divine salvation." It will be seen that he is here at odds with the Catholic view that the Trinity *is* the content of the faith—a view which is given classical expression in the Athanasian Creed.

Perhaps our author feels that he may be accused of Sabellianism, for he at once proceeds to charge modern theologians with this heresy—it may be in an attempt to ward off comments on his own predominantly revelational or modal view of the Trinity. These theologians teach a type of Judaism, he asserts, with special reference to the "liberals" of the past hundred years. For them Christ is the greatest of the prophets because He is that one most possessed of divine power. His statement is, of course, true of many modern writers, but it does not save his own position.

Brunner goes on to develop the doctrine of the Trinity. For Christian faith, acceptance of Christ as personal revealer of God means that "the divine personality, in whom the hidden God makes Himself known unto us, is not a mere . . . transitory phenomenon in the form of God, a transparency, a symbol, but is itself the personal eternal God." And "it is only possible to know the truly personal God in the God who manifests Himself in the personal Word of revelation." It is the God "who communicates Himself who is the true and real God." His revelation *is* His love. "God manifests Himself to us in revelation as one who communicates Himself, as love."

Since this communication of Himself, which is the Word, is actually God Himself, we may conclude "that in Himself God is one who gives Himself." It may be affirmed that "the Word, the process of self-communication, exists eternally in God Himself. When God reveals His being to the world as one who gives Himself, as love, this is what He is in Himself, in His very nature. Therefore also this relation between the revealer and that which is revealed exists within Himself from all eternity as the inherent and essential reality of the divine nature. The eternal Logos is that in which God expresses Himself."

What are we to say of all this? What right has Brunner to know so much about the God whom he declares to be absolutely unknown apart from His catastrophic Word, and even then to be an utter mystery? He denies all possibility of *analogia entis*, and yet makes these rash statements about the unknowable, whose inner being (on Brunner's premises) must ever remain a total *terra incognita* to the human mind. It is indeed passing strange. Herbert Spencer was criticized for postulating the

Unknowable Reality and then saying a great deal about it; he was an amateur compared with Emil Brunner.

But we are not yet done. For so far we have only a binitarian doctrine. Brunner finds a place for the Holy Spirit, however. He points out that "revelation means that God speaks and man is silent. God Himself acts, God alone acts, we merely receive, we merely endure." Man cannot even answer the revelation which is action of God. But there is faith, which is "the gift of God," although in some mysterious sense it is also a decision on our part, "decision of a fully personal and active kind." How these two statements are to be reconciled we are not told, but we are informed at once that "this decision is a gift, the highest activity of the self is the gift of God." And "this echo of the word of Christ in our heart, as the speech of God in us, is the Holy Spirit." The Spirit is divine, because He is "the Spirit of God who testifies to the Word as truth," while "the Word of God . . . mediates the Spirit." And so at last we have a trinitarian God.

But Brunner maintains that God remains hidden, "the mysterious God, the God of majesty, the source of all, even of revelation, whom we cannot apprehend as such, whom we cannot understand, but whom we can only worship as an unfathomable mystery." For "revelation does not mean that for the believer the hidden God has been resolved into the revealed God." We might ask what it does mean, especially since Brunner seems to know so much about that unfathomable mystery; but we must move on to quote another statement, thoroughly orthodox if the Spirit only found place in it and were not apparently left out excepting for His work in us as accepting the revelation of the Word:

"The God of the Christian faith, the three in one, the living God, is in Himself motion, because in His very nature He is love. . . . This love constitutes the very essence of God; it does not come into being first of all in relation to the world, but it reveals itself to the world as the divine essence. . . . In the Son the Father loves the world, as He has created it in Him, the Logos. The Son, the Logos, is God in respect of His attitude towards the world, His power of communicating Himself, the principle of creation, revelation, and redemption. In the Son, as the Son, God is the self-moved, the God who Himself descends into the world." Splendidly said—but how can Brunner say it, if he is true to his fundamental position?

It may be worth noting that Barth arrives at a similar position, but along a different route. He points out, in the *Dogmatik*, that the doctrine of the Trinity expresses the fact that God, "the knowing subject," who is never an object of our knowledge, is an eternal mystery to His creatures. It does not attempt to explain God; rather it puts a halt (in the phraseology of the *Dogmatik*) to human attempts to penetrate the mystery of God's being. It affirms that in the *Deus dixit*, which is the Word in revelation, God is subject, predicate and object; the revealer, the revelation and the revealed. Like Brunner, Barth maintains an internal movement in the Godhead, with three modes of being, as it were: Father and Creator, Son and Reconciler, Spirit and Redeemer. God moves and remains entirely within Himself. It is when by the Spirit men accept the Word that they know the Father and Creator. The Trinity guards the great secret of God's being.

Perhaps sufficient criticism has been given in the course of the presentation of Brunner's views. Some few final comments may be made.

The fundamental difficulty with the doctrine of the Trinity in the dialectical theologians is that they have no right to possess such a doctrine, if they are true to their own principles. Furthermore, their statement seems, despite explicit denial, to have more than a suggestion of modalistic monarchianism—God is a Trinity in revelation, and the more metaphysical statements (even if the "Barthians" were justified in making them) seem a bit strained. Finally, the Holy Spirit is given soteriological but no cosmological functions; He is only a witness of God in men's souls to the revelation of the Word.

The dialectical theologians have done a magnificent work in bringing back to Protestant thought the consciousness of God as sovereign, ultimate, the King eternal and almighty. It is too bad that they have done this at the expense of a rationally coherent and intelligible dogmatic. Everything which they say that is valuable and true has its place in Catholic theology; but that theology has avoided the false emphases, exaggerations and negations which in the end make "Barthianism" our latest heresy.

W. Norman Pittenger.

THE CHURCH UNDER THE SOUTHERN CROSS

Archdeacon Whittington of Hobart has given us, in a recently published book, *William Grant Broughton*, a work of thrilling interest. It is the life of Bishop Broughton between the years 1829 and 1853, and tells the story of a brave and able prelate who laid the foundations of the Church in Australia in the face of tremendous difficulties. Few people in England today have any idea of the ecclesiastical situation in Australia a hundred years ago. The writer of this work has succeeded in presenting the facts in a very readable form, and, although more than eighty years have intervened since the Bishop's death, has revived his personality in so realistic a way that we are moved to pursue his story to the end.

In 1787 Australia became a penal settlement under a military governor. In that year the Rev. R. Johnson, the first chaplain, sailed for New South Wales with the first governor and two hundred marines and seven hundred convicts. The passage took eight months, and on landing at Botany Bay, January 26, 1788, the Chaplain of the Settlement held a service under a great tree in the presence of the troops and convicts. Mr. Johnson found the life very exacting, and after twelve years' service returned to England. Two other chaplains followed, and then in 1824 the status of the chaplain was altered and he became Archdeacon under the Bishop of Calcutta, for, strange as it may seem, Australia was then in that Indian diocese. Archdeacon Scott was the first to hold this new office, which he retained for four years only. Then came Broughton, the subject of our story, who gave twenty-four years to building up the Church in the new colony, first as Archdeacon and then as Bishop.

The prospect to a man of great intellectual gifts was not encouraging; it looked like banishment from all his old interests and pursuits for many years. Scott, his predecessor, wrote in 1824 to the Bishop of London: "The mass of the population here is vicious to an extreme, and for some

years past, and even at this moment, all society, with few exceptions, is too bad and too horrid to have anything to do with." But Broughton was not deterred by the distressing accounts he heard of the moral and spiritual destitution of the colony. He had the spirit of an evangelist which urged him to undertake the work.

Broughton left England in May, 1829, travelling in a convict ship with his wife and two children. There were many discomforts on the voyage, which lasted one hundred and eight days. On reaching the port of Sydney, he was received by the Governor, the Judges, and members of the Council with great ceremony, and the next day was duly installed as Archdeacon of Australia.

The new Archdeacon threw himself into the work with great zest. He found only eight churches and twelve clergy in New South Wales although the colony had been in existence some forty-two years. His first care was ministrations to the white settlers and the education of their children; then to provide spiritual ministrations for the convicts and to evangelize the aboriginal natives. He was a giant for work, and travelled great distances to Van Diemen's Land and New Zealand to know his flock. He gathered his little band of clergy together and instructed them in their duties and set before them a high standard of clerical life.

Broughton had a very definite policy for religious instruction in schools, and firmly opposed the Governor of the colony, who sought to establish an undenominational religion for all schools alike. It was the need of an educational policy that caused him to visit England in 1834 with a view to bringing pressure to bear on the Colonial Office. Meeting with no encouragement from the Home Government to provide funds for church schools, he turned to S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. These two societies contributed the sum of £4,000 to enable the church schools to be continued. During his visit to England the Government decided to found a Bishopric for Australia, and Broughton was nominated to the see.

In Lambeth Palace Chapel the new Bishop was consecrated on February 14, 1836. In the congregation was Edward Coleridge, the Eton master and valued friend of both Broughton and Selwyn, whose constant labours for the Church in the colonies produced most important results. Broughton had been anxious that his consecration should be in either St. Paul's or Westminster Abbey, but he failed to have his wish. Coleridge was also present when Selwyn was made Bishop of New Zealand in Lambeth Palace Chapel, and wrote an earnest protest against semi-private consecrations: "I could not help feeling that we ought to have been thousands rather than tens, gathered together as with one consent in St. Paul's or Westminster Abbey to witness the sending out by the Church of the first Bishop of her own appointment, and not, as we were, a few persons in an upper chamber—as if we were afraid or ashamed of that great deed which we came to sanction by our presence and our prayers. To such an extent has this system of private consecration been carried that it is an actual fact that my own cousin, the present Bishop of Barbadoes (Bishop Coleridge), was admitted to that sacred office in the presence of only two persons—Judges Coleridge and Patteson —beside the necessary attendants."

The new Bishop reached Sydney on June 2, 1836, and was enthroned three days later in St. James's Church. A great work lay before him, but he did not shrink from the task. He was ever an earnest teacher

declaring the whole counsel of God. He was resolute in maintaining the position of the Church of England in the colony both in the eyes of her own members and in the face of attacks from outside. He possessed gifts of theological and historical scholarship, and also gifts of clear-sighted courage and persistence in abundant measure; and by their exercise at a critical juncture of history rendered signal service in New South Wales and to the Anglican Communion as a whole. The Church of his baptism and ordination was to him "in doctrine and constitution the most accurate model that existed of the primitive form of the Holy Catholic Church." He was equally definite in his sacramental teaching. His sermons contain constant references to baptismal regeneration, and he had a firm belief in the Real Presence in the Eucharist.

The burden that weighed most heavily on Broughton's shoulders in the early years of his episcopate was the shortage of clergy. On his return to Australia after his consecration as Bishop, he received applications from several districts for additional clergy. In his difficulty he appealed to S.P.G., a Society ever ready to help, but he foresaw that he must tap some new source of supply. This led the Bishop to approach the dons in three universities in the hope of gaining recruits, but there was no substantial result. But he never gave up the hope of a continuous supply of clergy from the Homeland, and inspired his friend Edward Coleridge to work for this end.

Then came the veritable romance of the founding of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury. Robert Brett of Stoke Newington paid a visit to Canterbury in 1843, and was filled with horror as he beheld the utter desolation of the ruins of the once famous monastery of St. Augustine. Returning home, he wrote to a Church newspaper expressing his dismay that a place with such precious associations should be left in such a state of neglect. This letter in the press caught the eye of Mr. Beresford Hope, who at once arranged to visit the ruined abbey; while he was in Canterbury he learnt that the site was about to be offered for sale. On his return to London Mr. Beresford Hope arranged to purchase the property. Coleridge, who had long in his mind the idea of a central theological college for training clergy for abroad, now got into touch with the purchaser of the property. From that time these two worthy sons of the Church worked in concert, with the result that the ancient monastery was rebuilt for the same missionary object for which it was founded. On St. Peter's Day, 1848, in the presence of a brilliant assembly of bishops, clergy, and laity, the restored abbey was consecrated, and St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, entered upon its career as a training school for the ministry in overseas dioceses. Thus Broughton saw one great desire of his life happily accomplished. Those who read this story will see how fitting it was that he should be buried in Canterbury Cathedral and his work honoured by a monument to his memory in the nave of the Cathedral. Broughton's episcopate must always hold a primacy of honour in the early annals of the Church in Australia. In days when the spiritual life of the Church was at a low ebb, he did yeoman's service as a religious teacher in a colonial outpost. He inspired his clergy by his singular devotion to duty with a new sense of their high calling; he travelled great distances to shepherd his scattered flock. He knew little of the Oxford Movement, for he left England before Keble had preached his assize sermon, but he was teaching the same truths and emphasizing the spiritual character of the Church and its independence

of the State, in much the same way as the Tractarian leaders were doing in the Homeland. Thus he laid the foundations of the Church surely and well in a new continent, on which succeeding generations have been privileged to build.

F. N. Heazell.

THE NATURE OF HELL

Mr. Sampson in his article on "The Nature of Hell," in the March number of Theology, refers to the doctrine of "Conditional Immortality." He condemns it on two grounds. (He says there are many others, but does not tell us what they are.) One is, that if the doctrine is true, we must need to know what is the composition of a dead soul, and if a soul is to dissolve, into what it is to dissolve. But this is an arbitrary requirement and purely subjective. Our knowledge of things spiritual is very limited indeed, and in order to believe in spirit we do not need to know, and do not know in the least, how it is created out of nothing in the first place. And if it had a beginning, it may surely have an end.

Again, he says that we cannot discover that anything in the world around us suffers extinction. But this does not *prove* that it will always be so, and it is no more difficult to believe that the world will be one day dissolved than that it was created out of nothing in the beginning. He also seems to rest his case upon the ambiguity of the word "law," as applied both to a moral law and to a law of nature. What did our Lord mean by "destroy both body and soul in hell," and "heaven and earth shall pass away"?

Moreover, he, like so many others, does not appear to allow his imagination as well as his intellect to try to grasp what is really implied by an endless existence "in a state of deep remorse." How can it be reconciled with that sense of justice which the Creator has implanted in his creatures that such should be the penalty for the misusing of the limited life here on earth, a life which is bestowed upon the creature by no volition or responsibility of his own? It is useless to try to avoid this issue by saying, as some do, that we do not know what eternity really means. For the issue is merely between "that which has an end" and "that which has no end," a simple concept which anyone can grasp.

E. G. P. Wyatt.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON ST. JOHN i. 2-4

Since writing on St. John i. 2-4 I find that Dr. J. O. F. Murray, in his recently published *Jesus According to St. John*, emphasizes the importance of the antithesis between δί αὐτοῦ and ἐν αὐτῷ; but he does not contrast ἐγένετο with γέγονεν as I suggest, so as to make the latter refer to the historic incarnation as the first coming of Life into the created world. I think this latter exegesis is important. It explains the immediately following reference to John the Baptist; and it enables us to interpret *v.* 14 as simply summing up all that has gone before. "So it was that the Word became flesh, and we (to whom he had given power to become sons of God) beheld his glory." If I am right, the Prologue refers to the historic incarnation all the way through from the words ὃ γέγονεν.

Oliver C. Quick.

CORRESPONDENCE

ENGLISH ORDERS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY

DEAR SIR,

Professor C. C. J. Webb's letter, in your January number, gives the weight of his name to the view that the question of the validity of Anglican Orders is closely bound up with the wider question of ecclesiastical authority. I think that Fr. Beevor's letter also confirms this view, but since he has written it to sustain their validity on Roman Catholic theological principles I may perhaps be allowed to comment on it. Before doing so, I should like to repeat that my object in writing is not controversy, but to make as clear as possible, in the interests of mutal understanding, the point of view of the other side.

The Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* describes a "rite" as including both matter and form (*partem essentialem*) and surrounding ritual (*partem ceremonialem*). In the same place, it speaks of the essential rite (*in toto ritu essentiali*) when it intends the word "rite" to represent matter and form only.* In saying: "If the rite be changed, with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church and of rejecting what the Church does, and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the sacrament . . ." the Bull clearly implies primarily "a departure from the requisite form or matter," without, however, excluding "a departure from the existing form of service," which also bears on the question.

The compilers of the Edwardian Ordinals introduced a new rite, containing forms which were new in the sense that the traditional and authorized forms of the Pontifical were set aside, and others substituted for them, which had not hitherto existed as sacramental forms. Did these new forms fulfil the conditions required by the Church for conferring the sacrament of Orders? The Bull maintains that the form for the priesthood is defective *in se* because it does not express definitely the sacred Order to be conferred or its grace and power which is chiefly the power of consecrating and of offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord. The absence from the form of any explicit mention of the *potestas consecrandi et offerendi* does not in itself perhaps render ordinations conferred by the Anglican rite invalid. The defect of the Edwardian form lies therefore in the absence from it of definite mention of the Order to be conferred. The same holds good of the form for the episcopate. The defect of the Edwardian forms *in se* is not, however, the only argument of the Bull in regard to defect of form, for it also maintains that even when the phrase *for the office and work of a priest* or *bishop* is included in them, thus giving them a possible verbal adequacy, they are invalidated by the new and untraditional sense attached to the words by the omissions and alterations in the rite which surrounds them. The argument from defect of Intention therefore is not subsidiary or superfluous, but is a necessary corollary of the argument from defect of form, and serves to

* In ritu cuiuslibet sacramenti conficiendi et administrandi iure discernunt inter partem ceremonialem et partem essentialem, quae materia et forma appellari consuevit . . . quae significatio etsi in toto ritu essentiali, in materia scilicet et forma, haberi debet, praecipue tamen ad formam perrinet.

complete and clinch it. A clearer realization of this will, I think, lead Fr. Beevor to modify his opinion that the Bull's phraseology blurs the distinction between a change in rite and a change in the essentials of form and matter.

The principles on which the decision of the Bull is based are to be found in the article of the *Summa Theologica* which Fr. Beevor quoted in his letter (IIIa, qu. 60, art. 8); but I think his reading of it is confused. St. Thomas says that changes in the sacramental forms are to be considered from two points of view; that of the intention of the user, and that of the meaning of the words themselves. In regard to the first, he holds that even unessential change* may invalidate the sacrament, if its object is to introduce another rite not accepted by the Church, and so to void the intention of doing what the Church does by changing the Church's meaning.† He is careful to qualify his statement by the word *videtur*, because here validity or invalidity turns in each case upon the intention of the change, and this can only be determined by circumstances.‡ In regard to the other point of view from which changes are to be regarded, that of the meaning of the words themselves, St. Thomas shows how any substantial change in the form invalidates the sacrament, apart altogether from the intention of the person who makes it, because in the sacraments words produce an effect according to the sense they convey, and a substantial change in the form manifestly alters its proper meaning (*debitus sensus*),§ and so destroys its validity. He deals only with change by addition or subtraction, and obviously never envisaged complete substitution. The changes in the forms of the Edwardian Ordinal can be considered from both points of view mentioned by St. Thomas. There was substantial change, since the new form of words was inadequate *in se*, apart from any question of intention, to convey the priesthood or episcopate. Had the phrase *for the office and work of a priest* or *bishop*

* Respondeo dicendum, quod circa omnes istas mutationes, quae possunt in formis sacramentorum contingere duo videntur esse consideranda . . . and he goes on to consider changes both unessential and substantial.

† Et ideo, si intendat per huiusmodi additionem vel diminutionem alium ritum inducere, qui non sit ab ecclesia receptus, non videtur perfici sacramentum: quia non videtur quod intendat facere id quod facit ecclesia. In the previous article (IIIa, qu. 60, art. 7, ad 3m), St. Thomas lays down that any corrupt pronunciation of the sacramental words, if done on purpose, would seem (*videtur*) to invalidate the sacrament, because it would seem to manifest an intention contrary to that of the Church. When the corrupt pronunciation is a mistake, however, it only invalidates if the change is substantial.

‡ *E.g.*, A person who used the word *wash* instead of *baptize* in the baptismal formula, to avoid the connotation given to the word *baptize* by the Church, would intend to introduce a new rite, and would invalidate the sacrament, though in itself the change is unessential. A missionary, translating baptize by the native word *wash* on the ground that no word for *to baptize* existed in the native language, would baptize validly, because he would not intend to introduce a new rite.

§ The *debitus sensus* of the sacramental form is, of course, the meaning given to it by the Church. St. Thomas shows, for instance, how the addition of the words *et beatae virginis Mariae* to the baptismal form would invalidate the baptism if the user meant by them that Our Lady shares in the incommunicable power of the blessed Trinity, because to give the form such a sense would make it contrary to the true faith. In a later *quaestio* he speaks of the minister of the sacrament as acting in the person of the whole Church, and of the words spoken by him as expressing the intention of the Church (IIIa, qu. 64, art. 8, ad 2m); and in discussing the question of an unbeliever administering a sacrament, he explains that since the minister acts in the person of the Church the defect in his faith is made good by the faith of the Church (IIIa, qu. 64, art. 9, ad 1m).

been included in the Anglican Ordinal from the first, the change in the new form of words would probably have been unessential (*i.e.*, the form would have been probably adequate *in se* to convey the episcopate or priesthood). But the intention of the compilers would still have been to remove from the new forms the *debitus sensus* of the Church, since they drew them up in opposition, as we hold, to the Church's authority, and as substitutes for the traditional forms that enshrined its mind. This changed meaning finds further expression in the contrast between the ritual surroundings of the new Ordinal and those of the old Pontifical. All reference to sacrifice and to the *potestas consecrandi et offerendi* was cut out from the former, and there can be no doubt that the compilers, by this action, wished to eliminate from the new rite, in any form that the Church of their day could recognize, the doctrine thus expressed in the old. There is a close unity between the ritual surroundings and the matter and form of the Edwardian Ordinal; the meaning of the words in the form cannot be divorced from their context in the rite.* If the ritual surroundings are a denial by exclusion of the sacrifice of the Mass, the same denial must also be implicit in the forms. The compilers of the Ordinal intended therefore in St. Thomas's words, "to introduce another rite which is not accepted by the Church," and their intention in doing so was undoubtedly to alter the Church's meaning.† The Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*

* Fr. Beevor says: "The changes in rite made by the new Ordinal are precisely parallel to those made in 1549 in the baptismal rite, where the Revisers retained the essential Form and Matter of the Sacrament, while modifying and altering the subsidiary prayers and ceremonies which had hitherto accompanied Holy Baptism." The parallel, however, is not quite precise; and that in an important respect. The Revisers of the baptismal rite retained the Church's authorized form, which expressed the Church's intention, whereas in the Ordinal they substituted a form which, apart from its inadequacy *in se*, was a new and unauthorized form, expressing their own mind and intention, which, in fact, so we hold, did not coincide with that of the Church.

† I do not think that Fr. Beevor has rightly interpreted the passage he quotes from Bellarmine's *De Controversiis*, de Sacramentis in genere, i. 21. Bellarmine is commenting on the first part of the above article of St. Thomas. He says that even an unessential change of words may invalidate a sacrament if the person who makes the change intends thereby to introduce a new rite. He then explains that there are two ways of intending to introduce a new rite: a rite which is new absolutely —*i.e.*, it has never existed in the Church before; or one that is not new in itself— *i.e.*, it has existed in the Church formerly, but is new to some Church which the user considers false. It is plain from the whole context of the words that by the somewhat ambiguous phrase *novum essentialem ritum*, he means, not a form which is substantially new, but merely one which is entirely new as to its wording, though substantially sufficient. Throughout the rest of the passage he uses, not *essentialis*, but *absolute* to express this idea. He means, therefore, by *novus essentialis ritus* or *novus ritus absolute* a form, including possibly its ritual surroundings, which has never existed in the Church before, and which might be adequate *in se*, but which is invalid because the words used in it bear a different meaning from the *debitus sensus* placed upon them by the Church. Hence he judges, on the principle laid down in the article of St. Thomas upon which he is commenting, that such a rite would be invalid not because it would be insufficient in itself (it is on Bellarmine's hypothesis adequate), but because it would not express the Church's intention. The Edwardian Ordinal illustrates this case except that, as we hold, its forms were inadequate *in se* as well as because of the altered sense of the words used in them.

The second case is illustrated by an example. The traditional baptismal form of the Greek Orthodox Church is not new in itself; it is new, however, to the Roman Church, which has a different traditional form. A Greek, using his traditional form with the explicit intention that it alone is valid, and that the Roman form is that of a false Church and invalid, would be introducing a new rite not absolutely, but in respect of the Church which he considers false. He would nevertheless baptize

judges on this ground that the proper meaning of the words *bishop* and *priest*, and the true conception of episcopate and priesthood, have been changed by the alterations and omissions of the Reformers, both in the forms and in the ritual surroundings, and that the new forms do not therefore express the mind of the Church or, in consequence, what Christ commanded to be done.*

We do maintain that the " power of offering " is so essential a function of the priesthood that to eliminate it brings about an essential change in its character, and makes it something other than that which Christ instituted. I do not think that the way in which the power of offering was given to the Apostles, or the terms, if any, in which they spoke and thought of it, are of importance for the purposes of this argument. It was clearly intended by our Lord to be an essential part of their commission, or it would not have taken the place it subsequently did in the teaching of the universal Church. The Reformers, in word and action, denied or cast doubt on any doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice which would have been accepted by the Church of their time, and these denials and doubts were reflected in the liturgies and Ordinals they composed. Fr. Beevor summarizes my argument in two propositions: (*a*) That the power of offering is such an essential function of the office of the priesthood that any repudiation of the view that that office involves the " power of offering " must constitute an explicit intention† not to continue that office. My argument would, however, be more accurately stated as follows: That the repudiation of the belief that that office involves the " power of offering " led to action (viz., consecration and ordination by a new rite) which resulted in the cessation of that office. The man who added our Lady's name to the baptismal formula, meaning to make her a sharer in the incommunicable power of the blessed Trinity, intended to baptize according to Christ's command, but in fact, as a result of his action, he failed to do so.

With regard to the second proposition: (*b*) that the Anglican Revisers of the Ordinal did in fact make a such repudiation by omitting any reference to this power . . . the same principle applies. Intention to do what Christ commands does not necessarily result in Christ's command being carried out. I do not doubt that the Reformers intended to celebrate and consecrate in accordance with our Lord's commands. But in fact,

---

validly, though his intention would be in direct opposition to that of the actually true Church, the Roman Church; the reason being that his intention would be to do what the supposedly true Church does, which for him is the Orthodox Church, and this is sufficient for internal intention; while the rite he used would express the intention of the actually true Church, because both the Latin and the Greek forms are of equal Catholic authority. This case is clearly concerned with internal intention, since there is no question of an externally manifested intention other than that of the Church.

* Nam semel novato ritu, ut vidimus, quo nempe negetur vel adulteretur sacramentum ordinis, et a quo quaevis notio repudiata sit consecrationis et sacrificii; iam minime constat formula, " Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," qui Spiritus cum gratia nimirum sacramenti, in animam infunditur; minimeque constant verba illa, " ad officium et opus presbyteri vel episcopi " ac simila, quae restant nomina sine re quam instituit Christus.

† My original sentence was clumsy. It would have conveyed my meaning better had I written: " Their explicit intention was to continue those orders which had been in Christ's Church since the Apostles' time, *but they wished to purge them* from certain elements which they regarded as accretions forming no part of the teaching of the primitive Church."

so we hold, they came to believe about the priesthood and the Mass otherwise than our Lord intended, and they embodied their beliefs in a new rite, and thereby removed the official expression of the Church's mind and intention and substituted their own. Those who use their rite, whatever their internal intention may be, cannot externally intend to do what the Church does or what Christ commands.

It is precisely here, as Fr. Beevor says, and as Professor Webb has made clear, that the crux of the matter lies. For us, the intention of the Church of today is identical with the mind and intention of Christ, and to alter the Church's intention is to fail to do what the true Church founded by Christ intends to do.* There may be terrible failure on the part of contemporary Catholics, in any station and at any period, to live their Faith; terrible slackness and lack of vision in apprehending and applying its truths to the immediate circumstances of life; corruption in the highest places, toleration of sloth and evil, and widespread superstition in popular belief. In every age history shows that there is much cause for self-accusation and contrition; in some ages, as at the Reformation, the account is almost overwhelming. But we believe that the faith which our Lord committed to His Church is preserved and interpreted in it by the power of the Holy Ghost, and that the truths which it teaches as of faith can never be contrary to His mind and intention.

I do not think that even the humanly speaking insuperable obstacle of our difference concerning the nature and authority of the Church ought to prevent us from taking possible means to see and understand what is true in each other's positions. This, with prayer, is the only way in which we can prepare for the reunion of Christendom. The rest is in the hands of God.

Yours, etc.,
HENRY ST. JOHN, O.P.

BLACKFRIARS SCHOOL,
LAXTON, STAMFORD,
February 3, 1937.

* "Evidence of departure from the contemporary Church's intention," says Fr. Beevor, "is only significant if it can be shown to constitute evidence of departure from the Lord's intention. It becomes irrelevant when there is clear identification of purpose with His intention." It becomes irrelevant, surely, only if there is no difference between purposing to do what Christ commands and actually doing it. Evidence of purposing to depart is not the same as evidence of departure. To purpose to do what Christ commands is sufficient for internal intention; but the rite which manifests intention externally must actually express His command.

REVIEW

My Way of Faith. By M. D. Petre. Pp. xxvi+342. Dent. 10s. 6d.

Readers of this poignantly interesting volume are likely to find it hard to persuade themselves that the writer is a septuagenarian, until they come to think of dates. Yet anyone who reads it side by side with a very sympathetic book, *Modernism. A Record and Review* (Pitman, 1908), by Mr. A. Leslie Lilley, then Vicar of St. Mary's, Paddington, or with *Father Tyrrell's Modernism: An Expository Criticism of 'Through Scylla and Charybdis,'* in *an Open Letter to Mr. Athelstan Riley* (Kegan Paul, 1909), by Hakluyt Egerton, and reflects upon what had been published down to that date and what has happened since, will not only recall the vigour of controversies—historical, philosophical, religious and ecclesiastical—which marked the first decade of this century, but also the clash of personalities even more than of principles which had so much to do with determining the cause, if not the issue. In a chapter to which she has given the title "Modernism. Inner Problems," Miss Petre observes with regard to the Encyclical *Pascendi* that "no one can fail to note the presence of an outside hand, not that of the Pope; of a theologian who was out to rout other theologians; a philosopher who was opposed to other philosophers; an exegetist who was defending his own exegetical conclusions. Others than the Pope were having their say, and were having it in his name. This gives a sense of injustice; as though an appeal to Cæsar were being judged in a lower court." Apart from the last sentence the objection might perhaps seem a little captious, since no one ought to deny the right of anyone who assumes responsibility for a document to avail himself of help in its composition if he think fit. Whose was the drafting hand may have a certain historical importance or at least interest to the curious, but the responsibility belongs to the ostensible author. Yet if, as many thought and some said, the hand was the hand of Billot, it is hardly surprising that to George Tyrrell it seemed that the formulation of propositions which *inter alia* made his own position impossible might have been given to some one other than another member of the Society of Jesus. That, again, is unreasonable, since the issues raised and dealt with were larger than personal concerns. The real question was the limits of intellectual freedom, and that was a dangerous question indeed to raise in a Church in which the

voice of Authority was expressed within the same half-century in the Syllabus of Pius IX., the Vatican Definition, and the decree *Lamentabili* of Pius X. Even the latitude oeconomically allowed to laymen of social position had its limitations, as Acton realized, and there are few more interesting studies of Baron Friedrich von Hügel than those etched in from time to time as this volume proceeds, and not only in the chapter devoted to him. That "he did not tyrannize, but he did tend to *overwhelm*" is a judgment which will bring a kindly smile of reminiscence to many Englishmen of his acquaintance, nor will they find it hard to understand the feeling of a Frenchman like Henri Bremond with regard to him. But in the chapter entitled "Tyrrell's True Mission" there is more than one sentence which may give a moment's pause, even perhaps longer, for hesitation. "Tyrrell was an ardent fighter, as von Hügel found out to his cost after he had launched him into the fray. But he was not one to fight with the correct weapons of the diplomat, like von Hügel himself. . . . Von Hügel impelled an incautious man into the fight, and then expected him to exercise restraint and caution in the very thick of the medley. At a certain stage he would gladly have restrained him by any means other than those of committing himself along with him. But it was no longer possible." Or, again, "After George Tyrrell's death he wanted to fit him into his scheme."

Probably Miss Petre understood her compatriot better, far better, than Baron von Hügel ever understood anyone who did not, like himself, think in German, and her estimate of Fr. Tyrrell is the more moving because the insight of sympathy and affection has not precluded criticism, but set it in a right perspective. Yet it is difficult not to think that the resultant effect does some injustice to Baron von Hügel. That is not because what has been quoted above and what is said in other passages is inaccurate as a summary of certain well-remembered characteristics, but because phrases like "launched him into the fray" or "impelled an incautious man" are so singularly at variance with many things which Fr. Tyrrell himself said at any rate at one stage in a series of conversations with non-Roman friends like the late Professor G. E. Newsom, afterwards Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge. Nor, so far as the reviewer's recollection goes, would they be borne out by at any rate some sections of Baron von Hügel's voluminous correspondence which have never been published. One of the most remarkable documents in Miss Petre's book is a letter from the late Mr. Edmund Bishop, in which he says of his joining the Roman Church in 1867 that he knew that it implied

"the end of my living share in the movements of minds going on around me." She describes it not unjustly as "a tragic utterance," but readers of books like Mr. Wilfrid Ward's *Ten Personal Studies* (Longmans, 1908) will know what is meant. Such an attitude would have been impossible for von Hügel in any case, even if his natural bent had enabled him to find an outlet for intellectual activity in the comparative security of liturgical studies, and thus to remain, in Mr. Bishop's phrase, "*inter mortuos liber.*" But it is at least permissible to suggest that from his own point of view he would not only have sacrificed a vantage-ground which it was of the utmost importance to hold for reasons by no means personal, but he would have gone beyond what he really thought and felt if he had shown himself willing to say what many wished him to say and judged that he ought logically to have said. When the volume of his Letters was published there were many who expressed sadness as well as disappointment, as in regard to promise that remained unfulfilled and had even been withdrawn. But there is another view which to some seemed truer. Miss Petre quotes a saying of Henri Bremond: "Why does he not see that it is better to have taught us how to walk than to want to lead us?" and adds, "It was not exactly that he wanted to lead us, but that he was critical and apprehensive so soon as the question was one that he either did not want to ask himself, or that he had already answered in a different way from ours." It is possible to recall more than one occasion on which it was almost painfully clear that Baron von Hügel did want to lead, but to the acceptance of his own solution of the problem. If to his schematic mind it was disturbing when things or persons would not "stay put," it would have been even more disturbing if, when those whom he had "taught how to walk" showed signs of deviating from what he deemed it of the utmost importance to show to be permissible within the bounds of orthodoxy as understood in the Roman Church, the instructor were expected to run on ahead down alleys which they had chosen, not himself.

Miss Petre invites her readers "to take what interests them and to leave the rest." And to some what has hitherto been taken may well seem relatively unimportant in contrast with the character-study afforded by the greater part of the book. It is certainly not one that is likely to be easily forgotten, for the writer has an almost uncanny gift of description and analysis at the same time. Now it yields a delightful story of a child who wished to know if angels have *real* wings, now a horrible one of a preacher's attempt "to give one a sense of unending time, in its relation to unending torment," now a picture of herself in Rome as a more or less professional student

of Thomism (and for a contrast the attitude of men like Père Laberthonnière). That is not horrible but prodigious, and one or two of the comments suggest a speculation as to what might have happened if she had been brought up on the philosophical writings of the late Lord Balfour in the same way as she was on those of Lamennais and of St. Thomas. The child who was always longing "for a forest big enough to be *lost in*," and for whom the woods around her home were never big enough "*because I knew the way out*," was not likely to find life very easy when she grew up; nor did she. But neither could she otherwise have been the compeer and critic as well as the friend of men whose influence has endured not because the inferences that they drew were always sound, or the solutions that they propounded were always adequate even from their own point of view, but because of the urgency of their insistence that the pre-Copernican age was past in theology no less than in natural science.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

NOTICES

LES PSAUMES: TRADUCTION RHYTHMÉE D'APRÈS L'HÉBREU. By Professor L. Desnoyers. Paris: Deselée de Brouwer et Cie. 35 frs.

This is a posthumous work, published eight years after the author's death. According to an unfinished preface, the translation, begun during the Great War, was intended in the first instance as " un apaisement d'âme tout personnel." Finding that the Psalms of suffering did not console him, though they helped him to suffer better, M. Desnoyers turned to the Psalms of nature, and in the end was led to translate the whole of the Psalter—a spare-time labour of love, the fruit of much meditation and prayer.

This translation, which is in rhythmical prose, is an attempt—and, as far as one who is not a Frenchman can judge, a successful attempt—to give the exact meaning of the original Hebrew and at the same time to reproduce as much of the form in which each Psalm was written as the resources of the French language will allow.

At the head of each Psalm there is a brief analysis of its contents, carefully done and a real help to meditation. A limited use is made of footnotes, which serve to explain difficult verses, the poet's mentality, or his religious sentiments. These are neat, scholarly, sometimes shrewd, and always charming, even when they are platitudinous.

The brevity of the footnotes is amply compensated for by the fulness of the Introduction, which contains many good things, notably a chapter on " How to Read the Psalms." M. Desnoyers has not hesitated to accept the more certain of the emendations suggested by the ancient versions, and that he is not unaware of the work of modern scholars is seen by the use he has made of Kittel's *Biblica Hebraica*. His general " critical " position may be gathered from the sensible way in which he deals with problems such as those raised by the self-righteousness and the imprecations of the Psalmists, and from the cautious manner of his treatment of possible references to a future life in Psalms xvi., xlix., and lxxiii. In a chapter on the Messianic Hope he draws a distinction between passages directly and passages indirectly Messianic, and says of the latter: " au sens littéral que l'auteur ancien a proposé, nous ajoutons de sens que Dieu voulait y ajouter, dans la connaissance parfaite où il était des événements chrétiens."

It goes without saying that there is a sturdy assertion of the Davidic authorship of all the psalms attributed to " the sweet singer of Israel," and the following note attached to M. Desnoyer's comments on Psalm xvi. suggests the extent to which Roman Catholic scholars are hampered by authority:

> " D'après la réponse de la Commission biblique donnée le 1er juillet 1933, les exégètes catholiques n'ont pas le droit d'interpreter les vv. 10-11 comme si l'hagiographe n'avait pas parlé de la resurrection du Christ."

But, notwithstanding these limitations, I can endorse the claim which the publishers make on behalf of this book and recommend it as " une belle œuvre de science, d'art, et de piété."

S. L. BROWN.

SOME GOSPEL SCENES AND CHARACTERS. By Canon Peter Green. Longmans. 3s. 6d. net.

In this book of 109 pages Canon Peter Green gives us seven short sketches of Gospel history, based throughout on the words of the New Testament but admitting a certain amount of imaginative amplification which, however, never strays beyond what is within entire possibility or even probability as a deduction from the scriptural accounts. The result is a very attractive book of devotional meditation.

We are introduced in this way to the life of our Lady, to the story of the first Epiphany, with a suggestion as to the probable meaning of the star which led the Magi. There follow accounts of the lives of the four Evangelists and their personal characteristics as the author conceives they may well have been. The concluding section is a very careful reconstruction of the actual events of Easter morning in which the several New Testament narratives, so often held to be discrepant, are skilfully harmonized. In all these sketches Canon Green presents the story with freshness and vividness and the characters live. He would hardly expect that all readers would be equally in agreement with all his interpretations and deductions from the sacred text, but in each one he helps towards a fuller grasp of the Gospel ethos, and here and there gives valuable exegetical hints and suggestions. This is certainly a book to be recommended, and those—and they must be a large number—who have obtained help from Canon Green's previous books will feel further indebted to him for the present volume.

W. R. V. BRADE.

FREEDOM, LOVE, AND TRUTH. By Very Rev. W. R. Inge. Longmans Green and Co. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Inge has done a great service to his generation in giving such a treasury of devotion as he has in this book. To know what has inspired him through his long life is in itself a great gift, and the selections he has made out of his vast reading are of infinite value. There is no attempt made here to criticize anything that he has inserted, or to suggest things that might have been included, but our object is to record our thanks for the publication of his own choice. His action in making such a collection of good things might well inspire us to do the same, not with a view to publishing our choice—it might not be at all as happy, or as good—but for the sake of enriching our own memories, lest we forget the treasures we once knew and loved.

W. E. LUTYENS.

BOOK NOTES

The Sacrament of Absolution. By C. J. S. Stuart. *Adoration.* By Alick Bouquet. Faith Press. 1s. 6d. each. These valuable little devotional books might easily be missed, and it is a pleasure to call attention to them. Fr. Stuart is a Canadian priest, who has provided a little manual for regular users of the Sacrament, fixing their thoughts primarily on Absolution. Fr. Bouquet, as those who know him as a regular contributor to *The Church Times* would expect, invests his subject with charm and poetic fancy as well as with reverence.

Five Great Non-Christian Religions. By C. H. Titterton, M.A., B.D. Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions. 2s. 6d. It is a pleasure to note the arrival of a new Christian publisher, with a programme of cheap and scholarly books. Whether it is wise to lay so much stress upon the Universities—the jacket depicts undergraduates engaged in serious talk in the Great Court of Trinity College, Cambridge—is a matter for the publishers. The present book gives brief but, for the purpose, adequate accounts of Mohammedanism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism and Shintoism. The summary of the last is very clear.

In the Voice of Praise. An Anthology of Praise and Thanksgiving. By E. D. Sedding, S.S.J.E. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d. The only criticism to be made of this charming anthology is that one would have liked something, indeed a good deal, from the pen of the compiler himself. As he aptly says, "A merry heart goes all the day." We have enough in the world to sadden us, and no harm to the severe side of religion can be done by looking always for subjects of thanksgiving. A curious slip appears in the attributing of "Hail, gladdening Light" to Newman instead of Keble; also, it was traditional in the second half of the fourth century, but this does not justify us in calling it "first century."

The Sacrament of Sacrifice. By the Bishop of Southwark. Longmans. 2s. A much-loved diocesan here prints part of his Primary Charge, in which he gives a careful restatement of Anglican theology. It will contribute a needed steadying. A pleasant surprise is provided by a beautiful Eucharistic hymn deliberately designed to convey doctrinal teaching, which yet contrives to be a real hymn.

Value: and other Poems. By Father Andrew, S.D.C. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. Another little book by Fr. Andrew will be welcomed by his many admirers, for its tuneful verse based on the great Christian verities and on God revealed in nature. The lines from a little child's prayer—"Jesus, wonderful and wee, let me cuddle close to Thee"—may perhaps serve as a test of whether or not one cares for the more intimate devotional pieces. To some they will seem exquisite; others will find in them a jarring sentiment.

Money Matters. By Ruth Kenyon. 1s. *The Church and the Public House.* By H. Keast. 6d. These two publications of the Church Literature Association of the Church Union illustrate very happily the wide sympathies of the Catholic Movement. Mr. Keast pays special attention to Fr. Jellicoe's work. Miss Kenyon's book is a brilliant sketch of the various theories of finance and banking and of the Church's attitude towards them. She keeps the balance as even as possible, without disguising her sympathy with those who attribute many evils to the concentration of power in the hands of a few bankers. Perhaps she pays insufficient attention to the view that banking results are in the last result a barometer recording the pressure of the multitude of individual transactions. Complete State control of finance is now in operation in many countries. Where, as in England, it is only partial, the standard of living is higher than elsewhere.

W. K. L. C.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher